LOCAL BODIES IN PRE-VIJAYANAGARA ĀNDHRA

Ph.D. Thesis

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY
DHARWAD
LIBRARY

T. Venkateswara Rao

Thesis

Submitted for the award of the Ph.D. Degree

of Karnatak University, Dharwar

1975

LOCAL BODIES IN PRE-VIJAYANAGARA ANDHRA

(A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1336)

TAK UNIVER
LIBRARY

By

T. Venkateswara Rao

Lecturer

Government College

Mancherial

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis on the Local Bodies in Pre-Vijayanagara Andhra has been prepared under the supervision of Dr.G.S.Dikshit,M.A.,Ph.D., who till recently was Professor and Head of the Department of History, Karnatak University, Dharwar. From the choice of the subject till the completion of the work, he has been a constant source of inspiration and help at every stage. I gratefully acknowledge my deep and abiding debt of gratitude and respect to him.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to all the scholars, whose published works and opinions have helped me immensely in preparing this work.

My grateful thanks are due to the Director of Archaeology and Museums, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad for the incentive given to me by sanctioning part-time research fellowship for a period of two years to complete this work. Sri Mohd. Abdul Waheed Khan, formerly Director of Archaeology and Museums and Dr.N. Ramesan,M.A.,Ph.D.,I.A.S., the present Director of Archaeology and Museums have kindly permitted me to utilise the material in the department. I express my deep gratitude to them.

The Director of Higher Education, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad permitted me to do this research work. I am much obliged to him. My sincere thanks are due to Sri G. Jagan Mohan Rao,M.A., Principal, Government College, Mancherial for his kind encouragement and help in completing this work.

My thanks are due to my collegue Dr. S.Gangappa,M.A.,Ph.D., who has helped me through some important Sanskrit and Telugu passages.

My thanks are also due to the Librarians of the Karnatak University, Kannada Research Institute, Andhra University, Madras University, Osmania University, Department of Archaeology and Museums, Andhra Historical Research Society (Rajahmundry) and the Curator of the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras for their help.

C O N T E N T S

		Pages
CHAPTER I :	INTRODUCTORY	1-17
Section 1 :	(i) Nature and Scope	1
:	(ii) Survey of the Sources: (a) Epigraphical (b) Literary Evidence	5
Section 2 :	Political History (A.D. 1000 to 1336) (i) The Eastern Chālukyas (ii) The Kākatīyas (iii) The Eastern Gaṅgas	8
CHAPTER II :	THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY	18-75
Section 1 :	Introductory	18
Section 2 :	Kinds of the Village Assembly - Bigger Assemblies in the villages - the Samasta Praja-Aṣṭādaśa-Praja - The Urivāru - the Okkalu or Iṇṭivāru - Halaru, the many - Gauṇḍas - the Mahājanas.	19
Section 3 :	Members of the village assembly - Meetings f the village assembly - Making of gifts - enue of the village assembly.	27
Section 4 :	ypes of village executives - Urināyakulu-añchavārim.	32
Section 5 :	fficials of the village - the āyagārs - he Reḍḍi - the Karṇam - the Talāri - the ārikāpu - the Purohit and others - Their emuneration.	35

Section 6	:	Functions of the village assembly - the assembly as a Bank - village lands - Hero-stones - village taxes - Fines as source of income - Irrigation tax - Public works (a) Temples (b) Tanks (c) Wells (d) Watershed (h) Public-Hall - Trusteeship-Administration of Justice.	45
Section 7	:	Conclusion	74
CHAPTER III	:	THE CULTIVATORS	76-94
Section 1	:	Introductory - Terms for agriculturists and their guilds	76
Section 2	:	The Chitramēḷi - The praśasti of the Chitramēḷi	76
Section 3	:	Organisation of the Kampulu - Members of the Guild - Leaders of the Kampulu - Venue of their meetings.	79
Section 4	:	Functions - Taxes - Temple Affairs - Land-Gifts to Temples - Endowments to Temples - Trusteeship (i) Land-Gifts (ii) Cash-Gifts and (iii) Gifts of sheep-Discipline - Agriculture.	86
Section 5	:	Cultivators and other village communities	92
Section 6	:	Conclusion	92
CHAPTER IV	:	THE NADU	95-123
Section 1	:	Introductory	95
Section 2	:	Location and administration of some of Nadus	96

Section 3	:	Nādu as a Group of Villages	109
Section 4	:	An Assembly of the people	111
Section 5	:	Venue of the Nādu Assembly	112
Section 6	:	Officers of the Nādu	114
Section 7	:	Functions of the Nādu Assembly - Nādu Assembly Functioning for a long period - Public Works - Endowments to Temples - Land Gifts to Temples - Social Regulation - Taxes - Common Fund - Royal orders - Summary of the functions.	115
Section 8	:	Sthala Assembly	121
Section 9	:	Nādu and other Associations	123
CHAPTER V	:	THE TOWN ASSEMBLY	124-154
Section 1	:	Formation of Towns - Alampūr - Drākshārāma Ghaṇṭasāla - Hemavati - Kistnapaṭam - Mōṭupalli - Nellōre - Tangeḍa - Tripurāntakam Visākhapaṭnam - Yenamadala.	124
Section 2	:	Some Important Urban Centres	129
Section 3	:	Nagara as a Commercial Corporation	129
Section 4	:	The Town Assembly - the Head of the Town- His Office - His Functions - Other Officers in Towns - Venue of the Town Assembly.	131
Section 5	:	Functions of the Nagara Assembly - Taxes- Municipal Administration - protectors of Gifts - Donors of Gifts - Builders of Temples.- Donors of Tanks and Wells - Bankers.	134

Section 6	:	The Nagara assembly and other Associations	140
Section 7	:	Life in Select Towns - Pērūru, Gaṅgāpuram, Anumakoṇḍa, Nellōre and Alampūr	141
CHAPTER VI	:	GUILD ASSEMBLIES	155-205
Section 1	:	Introduction - The Vīra Balañjas or Nānādēśi	155
Section 2	:	Some Merchant Communities - The Five-hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe - the Mummuridaṇḍas - The Gavares - The Paradēśi - The Ubhaya-nānādēśi - Their leaders - Their Meetings - Their Centres of Trade - Their Articles of Trade.	157
Section 3	:	Functions of the Guild of the Vīra-Balañjas- Trade - Control over customs - Arbitrator - Recalcitrant Members - To confer Titles - Temple Affairs - Gifts to Temples - Tanks and Gardens - Land Gifts - Trusteeship - Bonds of Unity - Guild Army.	163
Section 4	:	The State and the Vīra Balañjas	172
Section 5	:	Balañjas and Other Local Bodies	173
Section 6	:	The Teliki-1000 of Bezawāḍa	174
Section 7	:	The guild of the Teliki Thousand - Members of the Guild - Privileges of the Members - Units of the guild.	176
Section 8	:	Functions of the Guild - Corporate Life- Collection of Ari - Collective Gifts - Land Gifts - Gifts of Gold - Trusteeship - Temple Affairs - Gifts to Temples - Tank construction - Summary of the Functions.	180

Section 9	:	Conclusion	189
Section 10	:	The Pañcāhanaṃvāru - Their praśasti - Their origin - Their worship - Their qualities - Their profession - Their learning - Their Ācāryas - Their caste - Their quarters - Their achievements - Their privileges - Their city	190
Section 11	:	The guild of the Pañcāhanaṃvāru - Organisation of the Guild.	197
Section 12	:	Functions of the Guild	200
Section 13	:	Conclusion	203
CHAPTER VII	:	THE MAHANADU	206-217
Section 1	:	The Mahānāḍu	206
Section 2	:	Other Larger Assemblies	209
Section 3	:	Venue of the Mahānāḍu and other Larger Assemblies	211
Section 4	:	President of the Mahānāḍu	212
Section 5	:	Functions - Taxes - Gifts to Temples - Rules of conduct - To Develop Towns - Summary of the Functions.	213
Section 6	:	Conclusion	217
CHAPTER VIII	:	CONCLUSION - Results of the Survey	218-222
APPENDIX-I	:	THE NAKARAMU OF PENUGOṆḌA	223-246
Section 1	:	Introduction - Their Praśasti - Their Gōtras - Their sub-divisions - Their Quarters.	223

Section 2	:	Nakaramu of Penugonda	226
Section 3	:	Numerical suffix of the Nakaramu	226
Section 4	:	Members of the Nakaramu - Qualities of the members	228
Section 5	:	Units of the Nakaramu	231
Section 6	:	Venue of the Nakaramu	232
Section 7	:	Head of the Nakaramu	233
Section 8	:	Functions of the Nakaramu - collection of Tolls - To protect the Gifts - Temple construction - Gifts to Temples - Tanks, Gardens and Wells - Learning - Samaya Dharma.	234
Section 9	:	The Authenticity of Vaiśyapurāṇamu: The Contents of the Vaiśyapurāṇamu - Epigraphic Evidence - The Kōmati community at present - The Historicity of the Purāṇamu - Conclusion.	240
APPENDIX-II	:	AN INDEX OF REFERENCES	246-265
APPENDIX-III	:	GLOSSARY	266-285
ABBREVIATIONS			286-287
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY			288-300
MAPS	(i)	Pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra	8-9
	(ii)	Select Nāḍus of the Times	95-96
	(iii)	Important Towns of the period	125-126
	(iv)	Select centres of the Nānādēśis	162-163
	(v)	Select Centres of the Mahānāḍu	210-211
	(vi)	Select centres of the Nakaramu of Penugonda	231-232

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

SECTION: 1

(1) NATURE AND SCOPE

The subject matter of this thesis is a study of the organisation and the working of the Local Bodies in Pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra. It extends in area to the present State of Āndhra Pradesh and covers the period from A.D.1000 to 1336, i.e., from the re-establishment of the Eastern Chālukya power at Vēṅgi by Saktivarman to the rise of the Vijayanagara Empire to power. With the help of lithic records mainly found in Āndhra, it is intended to assess how the Local Bodies functioned by means of their assemblies in villages, towns and districts. A few epigraphs from outside Āndhra are also taken into consideration for elucidating some points relating to the organisation and functions of the Local Bodies. The Agrahāra assembly is not included in this work as the information available on Agrahāras in Āndhra is sufficient for an independent thesis*.

The period from A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1336 is important in the history of Āndhra for several reasons. The year A.D. 1000 has a great political significance. The Eastern Chālukyas, who ruled over coastal Āndhra, extending from Gañjām to Nellōre, for about three and half centuries, lost their independence. However, they continued to rule for another 75 years, but only as feudatories of the Chōḷas. By A.D. 1076, the kingdom of Vēṅgi became a province of the Chōḷa empire under Kulōttuṅga I. The Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa

---

* Dr.S.L.Shantakumari prepared her thesis on Agrahāras in Ancient Karnātaka (1970, Karnātak University, Dharwar), the Agrahāras in mēdieval Āndhra may be studied as the subject matter for a thesis.

established their authority over the region of Telaṅgāṇa and Rāyalasīma. In fact, the Chōḷa influence over ~~the~~ coastal Āndhra and the Chālukya influence over Telaṅgāṇa and Rāyalasīma led to the dawn of a new period in the history of Āndhra - a period of vigorous development in social, economic and religious fields. This many-sided activity in the country was unknown before its contact with the Chōḷa-Chālukya cultures. The Kākatīyas, who were destined to establish the second great dynasty in the country, were just becoming a force by themselves in politics. The year A.D.1336 marks the rise of Vijayanagara and with it a new era dawned in south India. This period marked the decline of Buddhism and Jainism and the rise of Śaivism. It was a period of intense temple construction. The temple became the centre of religious worship and cultural activities. This period also witnessed the growth and development of Telugu literature and the rise of many educational institutions. Many corporate bodies of different kinds came to function on a democratic basis. They exercised much influence and authority over allied communities in different places. Therefore this period (1000 A.D. - 1336 A.D.), which has a certain unity, has been selected for the present enquiry.

This work is divided into eight chapters. Chapter one is an introduction to the thesis. It deals with the sources followed by a brief review of the political history of the period. The second chapter deals with the village assembly - the first local body studied in this thesis. Kinds of village assembly, members and their meetings, venue, officials and functions - are some of the subjects described in this chapter. The guild of cultivators forms

the subject matter of the third chapter. Terms for agriculturists and their guilds, Chitramēḷi and its tradition, organisation of the Kāṁpulu, their leaders, the venue of the meetings and functions are described here. The fourth chapter contains a description of the nāḍu assembly and nāḍu as an administrative division. The venue and purpose of its meetings and its officers are some of the subjects dealt with. The town assembly forms the subject-matter of the fifth chapter. Formation of towns and some towns of the period, Nagara as a commercial corporation, town assembly, its venue, officials and functions are the subjects dealt with. The sixth chapter is concerned with the description of guilds. The merchant-guild of the Vīra Balañjas or Nānādēśi and the craft guilds, such as the Teliki-1000 and the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru are dealt with here. Their organisations and traditions, purpose of their meetings, their leaders and their functions are some of the topics in this chapter. The seventh chapter deals with the largest local assemblies, which may be called as Mahānāḍu. Three types of such assemblies are described here. Their members, headship, venue and functions are dealt with. The eighth chapter contains the conclusion.

The Nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa - the last local body studied in this thesis, is described in Appendix-i. The origin and sub-divisions of the Vaiśyas, the nakaramu, its membership, units, venue and functions are described. The authenticity of the Śrī Vaiśyapurāṇamu is examined.

A new method is followed in giving references in this thesis. (1) Inscriptions on the basis of which this thesis has been written

are all listed alphabetically in Appendix - ii. References are not given as foot-notes or as notes at the end of the Chapters. From the Appendix- ii, it is easy to find out where an inscription referred to in the thesis is published; for example, if a Mōṭupalli inscription has been referred to in the thesis, the Appendix will show when and where the Mōṭupalli inscription has been published. If a number of inscriptions are found in Mōṭupalli, from the date of the record, it can be found out where this particular inscription is published. (2) Undated inscriptions are given as undated in the Appendix - ii and if there are a number of undated inscriptions at a particular place, they are listed as undated 1, 2, 3, etc. (3) The Appendix also shows the place, date, district and source of the inscription as well as the number of the page where it is to be found. (4) If there are more than one inscription carrying the same date at a particular place, the number of the inscription is given within brackets in the body of the thesis to identify it from the other inscriptions of the same date. (5) Inscriptions published in the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy are given as No. 20 of 1917, as is usual in works on South Indian history. (6) With ~~reference~~ regard to books ~~consulted~~ referred to in the body of the thesis, ~~the~~ their authors' name, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ their year of publication & their abbreviation alone are given. These details help to identify the book in the bibliography which contains the place and date of publication.

Appendix- iii contains glossary.

The thesis contains six maps showing pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra, select centres of mahānāḍu, nāḍus of the period, towns of the times, centres of the nānādēśi and of the nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa.

...ATAK UNIVE... DHARWAR

An attempt has been made in this thesis to furnish a fairly comprehensive picture of the local bodies. The five major local assemblies, such as the Mahānāḍu, the Nāḍu, the Nagara, the Village and the Chitramēḷi guild are described for the first time in this thesis. The guilds known as the Nānādēśi, the Teliki-1000, the Pañcāhaṇamvāru, and the Nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa which have been previously studied are included in the thesis because they also performed some of the functions of the local bodies mentioned above.

It may be mentioned here that much pioneering work on the subject of this thesis has been done by scholars, such as Doctors N.Venkataramanayya, G.S. Dikshit, R. Narasimha Rao, T.V.Mahalingam, A. Appadorai, Lallanji Gopal, K. Sundaram, Sarvasree M.S. Sarma, K.V. Subrahmanya Aiyar and K.R. Venkatarama Ayyar. This work is only a supplement to what has been already done on the subject.

(II) A SURVEY OF THE SOURCES

The sources for the history of this period may be divided into two categories, namely, epigraphy and literature. Inscriptions and literature of the period form the primary sources. Inscriptions and literature of the later period, traditional accounts, articles in Journals and published books on the subject form the secondary sources.

(a) Epigraphical

Inscriptions are the most reliable and the largest single source of information for our study. They consist of stone and copper-plate inscriptions. They are of two kinds, namely, donative and commemorative inscriptions. The donative inscriptions record

gifts to temples, public works like tanks, and charitable institutions like chaultries, whereas the commemorative inscriptions contain the details of the achievements of the donors. Inscriptions of the border districts are either in Tamil or in Kannaḍa. Stone inscriptions are useful for the history of the local government, because they record benefactions of the rulers as well as of the private individuals with the consent of the local assemblies, as they were responsible for their maintenance. Copper-plate inscriptions record gifts of villages or lands as agrahāras to Brāhmin scholars and temples. They contain statements of government expenditure over education, Public works and cultural activities. These records furnish details regarding the donor, the donee and the donation. The donors might be the rulers or their officers or nobles or private individuals or merchant-guilds or the village assembly or the agrahāra assembly. The donees might be an individual or a group of Brāhmins who were well-versed in Vēdic literature and Śāstras or temples or charitable institutions. The donation might be in the form of gold or land or grant of income derived from taxes. If a village is an item of donation, the territorial division of the kingdom, in which the village was situated, is described. We also get an account of the object given, taxes exempted, stipulations made and boundaries specified. These grants were usually communicated to the local assemblies because the gift-property was exempted from taxes and the Local Bodies collected them. Private individuals generally entrusted their gifts to the local assemblies for maintenance. These records usually refer to the ownership of land, taxes, disputes of boundaries or property

succession, local conventions and corporate functions of the local bodies. Inscriptions of the contemporary dynasties in Karnāṭaka and Tamilnāḍu are highly useful for elucidating some doubtful points. They also help to fill up certain gaps found in history of the period and infact, without their help, it is not possible to draw certain conclusions on the subject. In the same way, inscriptions of the later period are also sometimes useful. These inscriptions throw light on the economic and social conditions of the period. All these details are invaluable for our study of Local Bodies. Rice, B.L.(1909, p.184) aptly remarked that an endless variety of details might be collected from the inscriptions to illustrate different features in administration.

(b) Literary evidence

Next to inscriptions, literary evidence, both religious and secular, forms an important source of information. It can be divided into indigenous and foreign. It gives many details regarding social, economic, religious and cultural activities of the period. It adds information to the details found in the inscriptions. Vijñānēśvara's Mitākshara (A.D. 1070 to 1100) is the most useful work of the contemporary period. It helps us to know several details of the judicial system. It is of much value for understanding the guilds. Kētana's Vijñānēśvarīyamu, a Telugu rendering of Vijñānēśvara's Mitākṣhara, is valuable in throwing light on administration and social conditions of the times. Kētana belongs to the second half of the 13th century. Maḍiki Singana's Sakalanīti Sammatamu (A.D.1400 to 1440) is an useful work on administration and polity. It includes stanzas or poems from the earlier writers. Bhāskarāchārya's Vaiśyapurāṇamu, a Telugu Padyakāvya, purported to have been written in A.D.1508,

deals with the organisation and functions of town assemblies. It is useful in particular, to know the organisation and working of the Nakaram of Penugoṇḍa in pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra. It also helps us to know the communal organisation of the Vaiśyas.

The important foreign traveller of the period was Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller. He visited Mōṭupalli during the time of the Kākatīya Rudramadēvi. He left a valuable account which holds good with regard to the conditions that prevailed under the Kākatīyas. The Mōṭupalli inscriptions of Gaṇapatidēva and Anavōta Reḍḍi, which furnish details of the sea-borne trade of Āndhra, trade in diamonds and textiles, corroborate richly the account of Marco Polo.

Traditional accounts are to be found in Mackenzie Manuscripts and Local Records. Mackenzie Manuscripts contain inscriptions, palm-leaves, cātu-verses, the village accounts, known as guḍikaṭṭu or āyakaṭṭu and a mine of information relating to temples, agriculture, irrigation, crops, handicrafts, reclamation of forest lands, new settlement of cultivators and other social and economic conditions of the people. The guḍikaṭṭu account is useful to know the village administration. C.P.Brown's Local Records, which are in sixty-two volumes, contain important information from the Mackenzie collection. Thus the traditional accounts form a valuable source of information for history.

SECTION: 2

POLITICAL HISTORY (A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1336)

The following brief account of the political history of the period is intended to serve as a general background to the

study of Local Bodies. Indeed, the Local Bodies functioned, by and large, unaffected by the political changes. However their smooth functioning was conditioned by a stable political authority and an effecient administrative system. Hence it is necessary to describe briefly the political history of the period.

(I) The Eastern Chālukyas from Saktivarman I to Rājēndra (Kulōttuṅga I)

The kingdom of Vēṅgi was founded in A.D.640 by Kubja Vishnuvardhana, brother of Pulakēsin II, the Western Chālukya king of Badāmi. Vishnuvardhana and his successors were known as the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṅgi. At the beginning of the 11th century there was political confusion in the history of the Eastern Chālukyas. In A.D. 973 Dānārṇava (A.D.970 to A.D. 973) was defeated and killed by the Telugu Chōḍa chief Jaṭā Chōḍa Bhīma, who ruled Vēṅgi from A.D.973 to A.D.1000. The year A.D. 1000 was a fateful year as Saktivarman, son of Dānārṇava, with the help of the Chōḷa king Rājarāja, defeated Jaṭā Chōḍa Bhīma and occupied Vēṅgi after an interregnum of twenty seven years. But he was defeated by Jaṭā Chōḍa Bhīma who ruled Vēṅgi again for another three years. In A.D. 1003 Saktivarman regained Vēṅgi with the help of the Chōḷa king by defeating Jaṭā Chōḍa Bhīma. He ruled Vēṅgi upto A.D. 1011. But Vēṅgi lost its independence and became a protectorate of the Chōḷa kingdom. However Saktivarman enjoyed full sovereignty in the internal affairs and brought the coastal region under his control. He

tried to give the benefits of a stable administration to the people. He promoted trade and maritime commerce. Vimalāditya (A.D.1011 to A.D.1018), his brother and successor, enjoyed a peaceful reign of seven years. He was succeeded by his eldest son Rājarāja (A.D. 1020-61), who had a long reign of forty one years, "a plaything of fortune". He was opposed by his half-brother Vijayāditya. Rājarāja lost and regained his kingdom. He submitted himself to both Chōḷas and Chālukyas as demanded by the circumstances. As Dr.N.Venkataramanayya has aptly remarked, "The sinister designs of his half-brother, coupled with the conflicting ambitions of the rival imperial powers, converted his fertile kingdom into a perpetual battle-field". He was enlightened, tolerant and a great ruler. He founded an efficient administrative system and developed a distinctive Telugu culture in the country. He made his reign a period of grandeur and glory in the field of Telugu leterature. After the death of Rājarāja in A.D. 1061, his half-brother Vijayāditya seized the throne and crowned his son Saktivarman II as ruler, who died in a battle after a short rule. Vijayāditya VII Vishnuvardhana ruled from A.D. 1061 to A.D. 1075. After the death of Vijayāditya, prince Rājēndra son of Rājarāja, became the king of Vēṅgi. He succeeded the Chōḷa king Adhirājēndra from his mother's side and ruled both the kingdoms under the title Kulōttuṅga I (A.D.1070-1118). He sent his sons Rājarāja Mummaḍi Chōḷa (A.D.1076 to 79), Vira Chōḷa (A.D. 1079 to 84) (A.D. 1089 to 1094), Rājarāja Chōḍa Gaṅgadēva (A.D. 1084 to 1089), Vīra Permāḍidēva (A.D. 1094 to 1107) and Parāntakadēva (A.D. 1107 to 1118) successively as Viceroys to rule over the kingdom of Vēṅgi. Kulōttuṅga I also maintained good

relations with the local Āndhra chiefs who served him faithfully. He allowed them to have internal freedom, conferred on them the insignia of royalty and raised them to the feudal status. Important among them were the local chiefs of Velanāḍu with their capital at Tsandavōle, the chiefs of Kaṇḍapaḍumaṭidēśa with their capital at Nādeṇḍla, the Parichchedins of Oṅgērumārga and the Kōṭa chiefs of Dharaṇikōṭa (Amarāvati). The Western Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI (A.D. 1076 to 1126) also followed the same policy and raised some of his local Āndhra chiefs to the status of feudal nobility in order to maintain the balance of power in the politics of the Eastern Deccan. They were the Haihaya chiefs of Palanāḍu with their capital at Mācherla, the Telugu Cōḍa chiefs of Kammanāḍu with their capital at Kōṇidēna, the Haihaya chiefs of Kōnasīma and the Biragottam chiefs in Kaliṅga. The Telugu Chōḍas of Nellōre were as much powerful as the Durjayas of Velanāḍu.

The 12th century in the history of Āndhra was a period of the <u>māṇḍalikas</u> or feudal nobles. They became politically ambitious and were fighting one against the other for political supremacy. An example of this was the <u>Palanāṭi-Yuddhamu</u> or the battle of Karampūḍi in which all the <u>māṇḍalikas</u> fought and perished. The Telugu Chōḍas of Nellōre, who involved in a conflict with the Yādava chief, Kāṭamarāju, fought a fierce battle and suffered heavily. By the end of the 12th century, the internal conditions became favourable to the Kākatīyas, who brought the entire Telugu-speaking area under their imperial sway.

(II) <u>The Kākatīyas</u>

The rise of the Kākatīyas to power constitutes an important

land-mark in the history of Āndhra. The Kākatīya period is one of the most celebrated one in that history as the country not only enjoyed political unity, after a long period of endless warfare, but also attained cultural unification of the people. It was a period of all round progress in the country. The authors of this historical achievement were the chiefs of Telaṅgāṇa who became powerful on the eastern frontier of the kingdom of Kalyāṇa in the beginning of the 11th century A.D. The Chōḷa-Western Chālukya rivalry in Vēṅgi offered an opportunity for them to choose the side of the Western Chālukyas and they prevented the Chōḷa expansion into Telaṅgāṇa.

According to the Bayyāram inscription, Durjaya was the orginator[1] of the Kākatīya dynasty. He was succeeded by Venna, Guṁḍa I, Guṁḍa II, Guṁḍa III (A.D. 900 to 912), Eṟṟa (A.D.912 to 950), Bēta I, Guṁḍa IV (A.D.950 to 990) and Bēta II (A.D. 990 to 1055), one after the other. Bēta was a local chief in Telaṅgāṇa and probably a vassal of the Western Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa. He made a mark in the rise of the Kākatīyas to power. His son and successor was Prōla I (A.D. 1055 to 1075), who was a distinguished general in the service of Āhavamalla Sōmēśvara I (A.D.1042 to A.D.1068). Prōla defeated several pretty chiefs, who were hostile to his over-lord Sōmēśvara I. For his devoted service and unswerving loyalty, Sōmēśvara I bestowed upon him the Anumakoṇḍa-vishaya as a permanent fief to rule. Prola I thus laid the foundation of the Kākatīya dynasty, which soon became a powerful kingdom embracing the whole of the Telugu-nāḍu. He was an able administrator and promoted the economic prosperity of

his fiefdom. He improved agriculture by constructing an irrigation tank, Jagati-kēsari. Prōla I was succeeded by Bēta III (A.D.1075 to 1090), who was a vassal of Vikramāditya VI. He maintained friendly relations with Ērra and Rēva, who were the heads of the Viriyāla and the Vēma-Chōḷa families respectively. He extended his territory considerably by adding the Sabbi-nāḍu to his fiefdom. Bēta III was succeeded by his son Durggarāja (A.D. 1090 to 1115), whose period was peaceful. His brother and successor was Prōla II (A.D. 1115 to 1158), whose period was significant in the history of the Kākatīyas. Taking advantage of the weakness of the rulers after Vikramāditya VI, Prōla II declared his independence and became the real founder of the Kākatīya dynasty. He made Anumakoṇḍa his capital. He defeated and brought under subjection Taila III (A.D. 1152 to 1163). He defeated king Jagaddēva of Vēmulawāḍa. His kingdom consisted of the Anumakoṇḍa-vishaya, the Sabbi-nāḍu and the present districts of Mahabūbnagar, Nalgoṇḍa and the region upto the river Krishna.

Prōla II was succeeded by his son Rudradēva (A.D. 1158 to A.D. 1195). He was an accomplished warrior, a great king and an empire-builder. He marched at the head of his army against Bommarāja, Mēḍarāja and Malligadēva and extended his territory to the north of Anumakoṇḍa upto the river Gōdāvari. He defeated the local chiefs in Telaṅgāṇa, namely, Bhīma, Gōkarṇa, Chōḍodaya and Tailapa. He sent his army under the command of Brahmi Reḍḍi against Drākshārāma and occupied the territory between the rivers Krishna and Gōdāvari, which he entrusted it to his brother Duggarāja who held it up to A.D.1163. He brought the region of Srīśailam under his control. In A.D. 1186 the Velanāṭi Chōḍas, who once ruled the territory of Vengi from

Simhāchalam in Visākhapaṭnam district to Darsi in Nellōre district, made an attempt to re-occupy the Gōdāvari delta but Rudradēva defeated them and strengthened his hold over it better than ever. He supported the cause of Nalagāmarāja in the Palanāṭi-yuddham and sent army to help him. His famous general, Kāṭa of the Malyāla family, defeated the Kōṭa chiefs of Amarāvati in the battle of Dharaṇikōṭa and subdued the Koṇḍapaḍamaṭi chiefs of Nādeṇḍla. He built the town of Ōrugallu (Warangal). He patronised art and learning. All these events show that Rudradēva was a great king and extended his kingdom from Kalyāna in the west to the Bay of Bengāl in the east and from Śrīśailam in the south to the Gōdāvari in the north. At the end of his reign, the Yādava ruler Jaitrapāla invaded the Kākatīya kingdom and Rudradēva was killed in the war. This led to the Yādava-Kākatīya conflict, which became the cause of their decline. Rudradēva was succeeded by his brother Mahadēva (A.D.1195 to A.D. 1199). He consolidated his power over ~~the~~ coastal Āndhra by entering into a matrimonial alliance with the chiefs of Nattavāḍi (corresponding to the region north of river Krishna).

Mahādēva was succeeded by his son Gaṇapatidēva (A.D. 1199 to A.D. 1262). He was the greatest of the Kākatīyas and one of the celebrated Āndhra rulers. During his rule, the Kākatīya power reached the zenith of its glory. Partly by diplomacy and mainly by war, he brought the entire Telugu-speaking area under his imperial sway. Thanks to his steady devotion and indefatigable energy, the Telugu-country attained political unity after many years of disintegration and disruption. His generals were Rēcharla Rudra, Rājanāyaka and Sōmināyaka. His victorious army moved from victory to victory and made the chiefs of Velanāḍu, Amarāvati, Addaṅki, the Ayya

family, the Kāyastha chiefs of Kurnool and Cuddapah and the Telugu Chōḍas of Koṇidēna and Pottapi and Nellōre to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Kākatīyas. He defeated the Eastern Gaṅgas and occupied the region of Drākshārāma. He made Waraṅgal his capital. He was an efficient administrator. He improved agriculture and constructed many irrigation tanks. He promoted trade and commerce. His Mōṭupalli inscription records the development of sea-borne trade of coastal Āndhra during his period.

Gaṇapatidēva was succeeded by his daughter Rudramadēvi (A.D. 1262 to 1296). A queen of good sense and sagacity, Rudramadēvi possessed a dominating personality, a commanding intellect and a sharp mind. She assumed the title Rudradēva Mahārāja and managed the affairs of the country very effectively. She suppressed all elements of disorder with the help of her faithful generals like Gōnagannayya and maintained intact the integrity of the Kākatīya kingdom. The account of Marco Polo shows that she was an efficient ruler and that she was liked by the people for her policy of equity and justice.

After the death of Rudramadēvi, her grandson Pratāparudradēva became the king of Waraṅgal (A.D. 1296 to 1323). He was the last of the Kākatīyas. He was an experienced general and able administrator. He ruled the country with truth and justice. But, internal rebellions and external invasions took place during his reign, shaking the very foundations of the kingdom. He suppressed the internal revolts and brought the situation under his control. But he was defeated in A.D. 1310 by Malik Kafur the commander of the army of Alauddin. He purchased peace by agreeing to pay annual

tribute to Delhi. After the death of Alauddin, Pratāparudradēva declared his independence and ruled over the country. But he was not destined to rule long. The Tughluk army of Delhi twice invaded Warangal in A.D.1323. Pratāparudradēva was finally defeated and taken a prisoner. After his death the line of the Kākatīya rulers came to an end.

To conclude, under the Kākatīyas the Telugu country attained political cohesion and administrative unity. It was a period of peace and security. The peace and prosperity of the people led to the development of industry, trade and commerce. They caused the clearance of forests and encouraged new settlements of the people. They took great interest in agriculture and irrigation. They created the Nāyaka (Nāyamkara) system and patronised arts and letters. Thus there was all round progress in the country.

(III) The Eastern Gangas

The Eastern Gangas of Kalinga were originally the feudatories of the Chālukyas or the Chōḷas for a long time. They were known as the Early Gangas and the Later Gangas. They became independent during the period of a later Ganga ruler Anantavarman Chōḍa Ganga. Kalinga was their capital. Their territory in Āndhra included the present districts of Srīkākulam, Visākhapaṭnam and Gōdāvari, extending from Ganjām to the river Gōdāvari.

Vajrahasta V (A.D. 1038 to A.D. 1070) was the founder of the later Ganga line of rulers. He ruled peacefully. His son and successor was Rājarāja I Dēvēndravarman (A.D. 1070 to A.D. 1078). He was a contemporary of Kulōttunga I.

Anantavarman Chōḍa Gaṅga (A.D. 1078-1152) was a great ruler of the Eastern Gaṅgas. He extended his territory from the river Gaṅga to the Gōdāvari. The next important king was Rājarājadēva III (A.D. 1198-1211). The Kākatīya king Gaṇapatidēva conquered the territory of Velanāḍu, defeated the Gaṅga king and brought central Āndhra under his control. Other important Gaṅga rulers were Aniyaṅka Bhīma III (A.D.1211-1238), Narasimha I (A.D. 1238-1263), Bhānudēva I (A.D.1263-1278) and Narasimha II (A.D.1278-1305). During the period of Bhānudēva II (A.D.1305-1327) the army of Delhi conquered Warangal and occupied Rājahmundry, Koṇḍavīḍu and Nellōre. Narasimha III (A.D.1327-1353) was the last Gaṅga king to be considered in this resume of political history. In his time, many important political changes took place in Āndhra. After a short period of Muslim rule, Kāpayanāyaka established an independent kingdom at Warangal. Prōlaya Vēmāreḍḍi founded the Reḍḍi kingdom in coastal Āndhra at Addanki. Rēcherla Siṅgamanāyaka became the founder of the Velama kingdom of Rācakoṇḍa. The Āravīṭi Sōmadēvarāja asserted his independence in Western Āndhra. The Saṅgama brothers, Harihara and Bukka laid the foundation for the mighty Vijayanagara Empire in A.D. 1336.

CHAPTER II

THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY

SECTION: 1

INTRODUCTORY

~~It was an assembly of the people.~~ The terms used to describe the village assembly were *Ūrivāru*, *Intivāru*, *Prajalu*, *Samasta-Prajalu* *Gāvundas*, *Mahājanulu* and *Aṣṭādaśa-praja*. The terms the *Ūrivāru*, the *Intivāru*, the *Mahājanulu* and the *Gāvundas* denoted the heads of families, while the *Prajalu*, the *Samasta-Prajalu* and the *Aṣṭādaśa-Praja* referred to all the people of a village. Sometimes, the assembly was known by its number, like the forty of Prēmpalli or the Nāvapalli *Muppadintivāru* or the sixty *Eītīlu* or the hundred and two *Gāvundas*.

The inhabitants of each village organised themselves into a corporate body even from a very early period. The Bhaṭṭiprōlu casket inscriptions of the 3rd century B.C., while referring to a village headman and a town corporation, contain the earliest reference to the formation and the working of local assemblies in the Telugu country. The Masulīpaṭnam plates of Chālukya Bhīma II (A.D. 934-45) refer to the youths eloquent at committee meetings. It may be said that the village assembly discharged a variety of functions, acquired a complex organisation and managed the affairs of villagers quite definitely from the Śātavāhana period. The committee system became popular in the conduct of the village administration during the medieval period, as is evident in the Uttaramērūr inscription of the time of Parāntaka I in Tamilnāḍu and in the Masulīpaṭnam plates of the 10th century A.D. in the Telugu country.

The Telugu country was divided for the purpose of administration into several administrative divisions known as *Nāḍu*, *Sthala* and *Grāma*.

The Chōla administrative sub-divisions like Kottam, Nādu, Valanādu and Mandalam prevailed in the southern districts of the Andhra country. The village, the lowest territorial unit, included in it one or more hamlets. A few villages were united to form a Sthala. The Nādu, which was also a group of villages, was the biggest territorial assembly in the local government. Thus the Nādu or Sthala, Town and Village were the important administrative units with four kinds of assemblies, called the Nādu, the Nagara, the Mahājanas and the Ūru. The part played by the village assembly (Ūru) is described below.

According to the Local Records (Ante, p.8) the people gathered together in villages for purposes of security and mutual assistance in their community life. The reclamation of land for cultivation necessitated the clearance of jungle which was most probably carried out by the members of the same community. A few families came together to form a village. The extent of a village depended on the land owned by all families in a village. The size of a village differed from one village to another. For example, a record from Edavalli of S.1162 mentions that the village was 300 khandigas in extent when it was granted to the Brāhmanas. According to the Pithāpuram plates of Vīrachōda, the Mālavelli village included in it twelve hamlets.

SECTION: 2

KINDS OF THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY:*

Bigger Assemblies in the Villages

There were bigger meetings in which all the people participated. A record from Madakasira of A.D. 950 refers to

* This classification is made on the basis of the nomenclature found in the inscriptions.

the assembly of the inhabitants of the four villages (nālkūru), Chirupi, Chintakunta, Chiriyavolalu and Vuluvattu. An epigraph from Tangeda of S.1230 states that the eighteen samayas (assemblies) and the Ubhaya-nānādēśi-pekkamdru gave to the temple of god Rāmanātha a duty on all sales at the rate of a vīsam per māda of the sale price. In this case, the village assembly was formed with the people of the 18 samayas and the merchant community of the place. It is evident that the heads of merchants took part in the village assembly.

The Samasta-Praja

The Samasta-praja denoted all the people, who in a village formed the village assembly. The earliest reference to Praja is to be found in a Chippagiri record of the 8th century A.D. The following are a few examples, which refer to the assembly of the Samasta-Prajas of a place.

S.No.	Place of inscription	Date	Members of the assembly
1.	Bekkallu	11th century A.D.	Samasta-janulu
2.	Pērūru	S.1041	Samasta-praja
3.	Bāpatla	S.1057	Prajalu of the place
4.	Voppicherla	S.1221	Samasta-praja, Nāyakulu and Kampulu.
5.	Nadigūdem	S.1222	Samasta-praja
6.	Pushpagiri	S. 1222	Samasta-praja
7.	Kokkirēni	S.1236	Samasta-praja, Kōmatis, Kampulu Gollalu, Brāhmins, Sālevāru Karnam and lekkapettuvāru

8.	Allūru	Ś.1239 A.D.1317	Pinnama Veṅkamgāru, the Reddis, the Karnams and the Samasta-praja of Aṛalūru.
9.	Makhtal	S.1243	All the Samayas (samasta-samayālu) of the place.
10.	Kopparam	S.1245	All the inhabitants (Prajalu)and Veṭṭisa-panivāru of Kopparam.
11.	Alampūr	C.V.E.23	Samasta-janulu.
12.	Alavānipalle	C.V.E.34	Samasta-praja
13.	Pāmulapāḍu	undated	Samasta-praja

The Aṣṭādaśa-Praja (the Eighteen Castes)

Another name used for the village assembly was padunenimidi-jātula-Praja or Aṣṭādaśa-Praja or padunenimidi-samayālavāru. The term Eighteen castes denoted the whole population of a village. It was an assembly of all classes of the people. It is evident from the following examples that the Eighteen Prajas possessed extensive powers and discharged several duties as a corporate body of the entire population of the village.

S.No.	Place of inscription	Date	The Village Assembly
1.	Nāgulapāḍu	S.1225	All the people of the Eighteen communities of the place made a gift to the god Malnātha.

2. Taṅgeḍa	S.1230	The Eighteen Samayas and the merchants of Taṅgeḍa made a duty on all sales to the temple of Rāmanātha.
3. Tēkmal	S.1230	Mahāpradhāni Puravari Mahadēva-Nāyaṁka made a gift of the cash income of the land-tax of the village of Tēkmal and the villages of that sthala with the permission of the Eighteen communities of Tēkuṁbeḍla (Tēkmal) to the god Bhōganātha.
4. Karavaḍi	S.1232	The Eighteen castes, the seṭṭis, the Kāpus, the Reḍḍis and others made a gift to the god Rāmanātha.
5. Kaṭukūru	S.1232	The Eighteen Jātula Prajas made a gift to the god Gōpīnātha.
6. Māṭēḍu	S.1232	The Eighteen Prajas made a gift of a part of siddhāyamu paid by them to nagaru to the local temple.
7. Māṭēru	S.1232	The Eighteen Prajas made a gift to the god Mallēśvara.
8. Mēlaceṟuvu	S.1233	The Velamas and all the people of the place made a gift to the god Svayaṁbhudēva.
9. Maṇūru	S.1236	The people of the Eighteen communities (aṣṭā-daśa-Prajalu) of the Maṇūr-sthala made a gift of cash revenue to the god Sōmanātha.

10. Medikondūru	S.1240	The Eighteen communities and the Kāpus of the village made a gift of vīsamu income to the god Gōpīnātha.
11. Gōtūru	S.1319	Refers to the gift of land made with the consent of the Eighteen-Prajas of the village headed by Namvireddi and Pāpireddi.
12. Gōtūru	S.1342	Registers the renewal of the above gift by the 18 Prajas.
13. Mahbūbābād	undated	The Eighteen Prajas made a gift to the god Jāyēśvara

The Urivāru

The terms Urivāru, Grāmīnulu, Grāmēyakulu, Uriprajalu, Sabhavāru or Grāmastulu were used to denote both the villagers and the village assembly. The following examples show that the inhabitants of a place were acting together in their corporate capacity on matters of common importance.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	The Village Assembly
1.	Ganapavaram	Of the time of Kulōttunga Rājēndra	The villagers (Uriprajalu) granted a piece of land to Kamōju
2.	Mukhalingam	S.1014	Tōtakalivaramunavāru (the people of Tōtakalivaram) agreed to maintain a lamp.

3. Mukhalingam(No.1094)	S.1045	Yētēdivāru (the people of Yētēdi) agreed to protect a lamp.
4. Mukhalingam(No.1090)	S.1045	Āmapemtavāru (the people of Āmapemta) agreed to look after a lamp.
5. Mukhalingam	S.1053	Bīrattānavāru (the people of Bīratta) agreed to continue a lamp.
6. Mukhalingam	S.1054	Bānivāru (the people of Bāni) in the division of Varāha-Vahtani agreed to maintain a lamp.
7. Mukhalingam	undated-4	Tāmaraceruvunavāru (the villagers of Tāmaraceruvu) agreed to look after a lamp.
8. Mukhalingam	undated-5	Jalamūrivāru (the inhabitants of Jalamūr) agreed to protect a lamp.
9. Rāzōle	undated	Ramgōlanivāru (the villagers of Ramgōla) agreed to maintain a lamp.
10. Srīkūrmam	S.1071	Yīūrivāru (the villagers of this village) agreed to continue a lamp.
11. Srīkūrmam	S.1074	Penumgōtivāru (the people of Penumgōta) agreed to look after a lamp.
12. Srīkūrmam	S.1091	Sālivendanavāru (the people of Sālivenda) agreed to continue a lamp.
13. Tadikalapūdi	S.1138	Refers to Grāmavāsulu or Sthānikulu (villagers) in connection with a gift.

The Intivāru or Okkalu

The villagers of a place as a corporate body are referred to as the Intivāru. The Intivāru denoted the households who were the same as the Okkalu in medieval Karnāṭaka. The households or cultivators in a village constituted the village assembly and the heads of families were its members. They acted as trustees of the *Local* gifts. A record from Nārāyaṇapuram of S.1054 mentions that the gift for a lamp was maintained by the Nāvapalli-thirty households (Nāvapalli-muppadintivāru-āchaṁdrārkamuganaḍapaṁgalavāru). An undated record from Alampūr refers to the head of the village assembly of the 300 Okkaligas, who built the Āditya-griha at Uttarēśvara.

Halaru, the many

The term halaru or paluvuru or the many was used for the village assembly. An undated record from Penukoṇḍa mentions that the halaru (all the people of the place) granted the gift of some taxes to the temple of Mailāradēva. In this case, the halaru represents the assembly of the village people.

Gāuṇḍas or Farmers

Gāuṇḍas was another name used for the village assembly. Gāuṇḍas denoted farmers. An inscription from Kaṁbadūr of S.805 records that the Gāuṇḍas and the Brāhmins of Beḷdugoṇḍe made a gift of some land to the Āditya temple. The members of the village assembly of Beḷdugoṇḍe included both farmers and Brāhmins. A record from Gunimorubāgal of S.858 states that the Ūru consisted of a number

of Gāundas or farmers. Another record from Kambadūr of S.887 registers that the hundred and six Gāundas of the village were ordered by the illustrious Polalchōradēva to take care of the Beldugonde tank. In this case, the village assembly consisted of 106 farmers or heads of families. An inscription from Hindūpūr of S.1109 records that a number of Gāundas, who came from Nagara-sīma with their carts, settled in the country ruled by Sōmaśankara Nāyaka of Ratnagiri. They founded three new villages. A record from Aṭakulagundu of S.1292 mentions that the Gāundaprajas (cultivators) of the village acted as a witness to a transaction. From these records, it can be inferred that the inhabitants of a village were referred to as Gāundas or Gāundaprajalu.

The Mahājanas

The village assembly of the Brāhmaṇas was known as the Mahājanas. An inscription from Chippagiri of the time of Chālukya Vijayāditya Satyāsraya (A.D.696-733) refers to a grant of land by Bantarasa to Dharma Bhaṭāra with the consent of the Mahājana-praje. In this case, the assembly consisted of all the Mahājana householders. A record from Madhuḍi of S.881 mentions that the Mahājanas granted some land to the Vishnu temple. A Pedda Tumbalam epigraph of A.D. 1106 states that the Mahājanas of the village Tumbuḷa made some contributions out of the toll revenue of the village for the service of the god Kareкanthēśvara. Another record from Chinna Tumbaḷam of A.D.1142 mentions that the one hundred and forty Mahājanas of Tumbuḷa gave some land for the service of the god Keśavadēva. An inscription from Bollavārapāḍu of A.D.1153 states that all the Mahājanas of Dayyālareyūru presented some land

to Rāmēśvaradēva. Another inscription from Durgi of S.1241 records that the Mahājanas of Dāravēmula granted a certain portion of their income to the temples of Rudrēśvara and Bollēśvara. From these examples, it can be inferred that the Mahājanas were acting as a corporate body in a village. They formed the village assembly, also known as the Mahājanas. The heads of the Brāhmin families were its members.

SECTION: 3

MEMBERS OF THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY

The village assembly was sometimes known by the number of its members. The number refers to both the membership of the village assembly and probably to the number of families which came together to form the village for the first time. The record from Nārāyaṇapuram of S.1054 refers to the Nāvapalli-Muppadiṇṭivāru. It is evident that the village assembly of Nāvapalli composed of thirty members and the village probably consisted of thirty families. Another record of S.1050 from the same place mentions the Nāvapalli Kāmpulu, who were probably the Nāvapalli thirty households. In a third record of S.1105 from the same place, the members of the assembly were called the Nāyakulu. Thus the village assembly was known either by the number of its members or by the inhabitants of the village. The members were called the Nāyakas. There are other similar examples. According to an undated record from Alampūr, the village Assembly consisted of 300 Okkaligas. Another inscription from the same place of the Rāshṭrakūṭa period mentions the Alampūr thirty, who were the heads of the Gāmuṇḍa-praja of Alampūr. They were called Grāmamukhyulu that is, the members of the village assembly. In this case, the

assembly consisted of 300 households with an executive body of 30 members. A record from China-Kandukūr of A.D.1243 refers to the village assembly of Kandukūr, which consisted of sixty Eyitilu, who granted one adda of land for the naivēdya of Rāmēśvaradēva. A record from Kambadūru of A.D.965 also refers to the village assembly, which consisted of one hundred and six Gāundas. Sometimes, the members were called merely by the number. A record from Bāpatla of S.1066 mentions the Prempalli-forty; that is, the forty members of the village assembly of Prempalli. The village assembly of the Mahājanas was also known by the number of its members. Some of them were the five hundred Mahājanas of Malvāna, the hundred and forty Mahājanas of Tumbala, and the three hundred Mahājanas of Pālaparru. It appears from this practice that even after the new households came, settled down and joined the village assembly as members, the village assembly continued to be known by its original number which was prefixed to its name in the beginning. A record from Amarāvati of S.1080 supports this view. It refers to the Modadla Kāmpulu (principal cultivators) to whom a gift was entrusted for its maintenance.

THE MEETINGS OF THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY

It can be inferred from the following expressions that the village assembly functioned in an autonomous way in attending to its corporate responsibilities. These expressions also indicate that the village assembly held meetings, conducted discussions and took decisions. They are given below.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	The Telugu word used to denote the meeting
1.	Alampūr	Rāstrakūta period	iccunatlu kattadi cēsenu (agreement made to continue the gift).

2. Sanigaram	S. 973 A.D.1051	nodaṁbaḍaci-beṭṭina (endowed it after obtaining the consent of)
3. Alampūr	S.1022 C.V.E.23	samasta-janulu-kūḍi-cēsina-dharmamu (all the people of the place assembled together to make the gift).
4. Pērūru	S.1041	Pērūru-samasta-praja-yellayaṁkūḍi (all the people of Pērūru assembled together).
5. Konidena	S.1069	kūḍi-śrīkēsavadēvaraku-niccina kānka (having assembled made the gift to the god Śrī-Kēśavadēva)
6. Bhīmavaram	S.1099	iccitimi (agreed to give)
7. Oṅgōle	S.1194	anmatamuna (with the consent of)
8. Kulapāk	S.1201 A.D.1279	anumati (consent)
9. Voppicherla	S.1221	sahitamugānu (along with others)
10. Kaṭukūr	S.1225	beṭṭina datti (gave the gift)
11. Taṅgeḍa	S.1230	sannidhini (in the presence of)
12. Karavaḍi	S.1232	gūḍaṁ-jēsina-dharmamu (having met made the gift).
13. Kokkirēni	S.1236	icciri (gifted).
14. Allūru	S.1239 A.D.1317	neraṁgganu (in the presence of)
15. Makhtal	S.1243	saṁmādāna (with the consent of)
16. Kopparam	S.1245	istimi (we gifted)
17. Sarpavaram	S.1334	samayaṁ-nirvahiṁcina-samayulakuṁ (for the members of the assembly who conducted the work).
18. Siṅgarikoṇḍa	S.1365	sarvamānyamu cēsirigāna (gave as charity or free gift).

19. Chinakandukūru	undated	māsavatanu bettitimi (gave towards monthly expenditure)
20. Uppumāgulūru	undated	grāmasākhini (the assembly as witness).

MAKING OF GIFTS

Gifts were made in the presence of the inhabitants. The record from Madakasira of A.D.950 mentions that Gāunda Kādiyanna and Pallikāra Tuvanna were each granted some land for repairing the Olagere tank in the presence of the inhabitants of the four villages, Chirupi, Chintakunte, Chiriyavolalu and Vulavattu. A record from Allūru of A.D.1317 states that Gāla Muddanaboyindu and Dana Mādava gave some land as charity to the temple of Ishta Kāmēśvara in the presence of Pinnama Venkamgāru, the Reddis, the Karnams and the samastapraja of Aralūr. These examples show that the gifts were made in the presence of the village assembly.

Gifts were also made with the consent of the village assembly. The Tēkmal record of S.1230 refers to the gift of the cash income of the land-tax of the village of Tēkumbedla and the villages of that sthala at the rate of one māda to god Bhōganātha made by Mahāpradhāni puravari Mahādēva nāyamka with the permission of the 18 communities of Tēkumbedla. He was probably the officer in charge of the administration of the sthala of Tēkumbedla. An inscription from Makhtal of S.1243 records that Gumdaya-nāyanimgāru and Pradhāni Komdanāyanimgāru granted simganādamu-pannu to one Simgena with the consent of the samasta-samayas together with the Srī Vaishnava-samaya. A Gōturu epigraph of S.1319 mentions that Mahāmandalēśvara Apratimalla

Gaṅgaya Dēvachōḍa Mahārāja made a gift of land to (Kāśa) Chāmāya-baṭṭuḍu with the consent of the 18 Prajas of the village.

Meetings of the village assembly took place to make gifts to temples. A Kaṭukūr record of S.1225 mentions that the 18 communities, such as the Mahājanas, the Nagaramu, the Kāmpulu, the Balañja merchants and others joined together to make the gift to god Gōpīnātha. The Taṅgeḍa epigraph of S.1230 states that in the presence of (sannidhini) Dēvarināyaka, the 18 samayas of the Taṅgeḍa sthala and the Ubhayanānādēśipekkamḍru entered into an agreement to levy a duty on all sales in the town to the god Rāmanātha. An inscription from Karavaḍi of S.1232 registers that the Reḍḍis, the Kāpus, the seṭṭis, the 18 castes and others assembled together to make the gift of some land and taxes to the god Rāmanātha. A Mēlaceṛuvu record of S.1233 mentions that on the authority of Mamḍu Nāgireḍḍi, Bollayareḍḍi, the Nāyamkara of Bomirāju Eṟṟaya pregaḍa, the Velamas and all the people of that place gave some land to the god Svayambhudēva. An inscription from Maṇūr of S.1236 records that the people of the 18 communities of the twelve villages of Maṇūr sthala united to make the gift to the god Sōmanātha.[x]

VENUE OF THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY

It can be inferred from the records that the village assembly generally met in a temple hall or village hall called Chāvaḍi to transact its business. While in the case of the Brahmadēya villages, the membership of the assembly was confined to the Brāhmin residents of the place, in the assembly of other villages, the membership was apparently open to all the communities of the place, unless of course the heads of the households in a village were its only members.

x The two examples on this page from Tangeda and Manur have been cited in the chapter on the Nādus. They are given here also because the Sthala consisted of few villages.

The village assembly had its own executive and officials.

SECTION: 4

TYPES OF VILLAGE EXECUTIVES:

Urināyakulu

The Urināyakulu were the chiefs of the village. They resemble the Aimannigas or the Panchayat, in medieval Karnāṭaka. The Urināyakulu were the executive of the village assembly, called Urivāru. They looked after the gifts entrusted to them. They gave gifts to temples. They maintained perpetual lamps in the temples. A few examples may be cited.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	The village Executive
1.	Vēmūru	S.1050	Vēmūri Nāyakulu (the Nāyakas of Vēmūru made a gift to god Ramēśvara).
2.	Mukhalingam	S.1055	dinini-nāchandrārkamu-nadipiṁpaṁgalavāru Nakarapuvāda-Nāyakulu (the Nāyakas of Nakarapuvāda would maintain this gift).
3.	Arasavilli	S.1068	Iyūri-nāyakulu-āchandrārkamuna-beṭṭu (the Nāyakas of this village would continue this gift).
4.	Konidena	S.1069	Rācakodukulu, dēśaṭlu, nūka nāyakulu kūḍi urarūkayunulvari-pādikayi-nicchitimi (princes, cultivators and the chiefs of the village assembled to grant some land and the income derived from

		the village to the god Srīkēśavadēva).
5. Bhīmavaram	S.1099	Ūrināyakulu (the chiefs of the village) and Srīvaishnavulu granted some land to Akkasāla Pōtōju.
6. Mukhalingam	S.1107	Eśvara Nāyaku-Numkkināyaku-berasina-vārāchandrārkamuna-nadupamgalavāru (Eśvara Nāyaka, Numkkināyaka and others, who were the heads of Nakarapuvāḍa, would look after the gift made by Duggama, wife of Nāgadēva raṭṭaḍi).
7. Singavaram	S.1127	Simhapuramu Nāyakulu (the Nāyakas of Simhapuramu would maintain this gift).
8. Simhāchalam	S.1129	Iyūri-Ellamanāyaka-berasina-Nāyakulum (the Nāyakas of this village like Ellamanāyaka would maintain this gift with the income received from the land granted for this purpose).
9. Simhāchalam	S.1275	aiduguru-Nāyakulu-naḍupamgalavāru (the five Nāyakas would maintain the gift).

A record from Srīkūrmam of S. 1152 mentions the executive of the village assembly functioning at different villages in the

Varāhavamtani-vishaya.

S.No.	Name of the village	Members of the executive
1.	Simhapuramu	Āditya Nāyaku lōpaina Nāyakulu.
2.	Srīkūrmamu	Nārapa Nāyaka lōpaina Nāyakulu.
3.	Ippali	Gangama Nāyaku lōpaina Nāyakulu.
4.	Tāmaraceruvu	Vishnuma Nāyaku lōpaina Nāyakulu.
5.	Sanmukapamppuna	Kurivītibhīma Nāyaku lōpaina Nāyakulu.
6.	Eradapampuna	Tollabimallapa Nāyaku lōpaina Nāyakulu.
7.	Dharmavaramuna	Eranamandaliku lōpaina Nāyakulu.
8.	Bhōgapuramu	Dēśirattadlu (heads of the agricultural community of the place).
9.	Tādipariti	Mahājanas (heads of the Brahmadēya village).
10.	Mandalamu	Ponnadiya-Nāyakulu or the Nāyakas of the village of Ponnadiya.

PAÑCHAVĀRIM

It was a committee of the village assembly. Its duty was to realise the revenue from the villagers due to the king on certain class of lands amounting to five shares (pañcha-vāra) out of the six of the entire assessment. It is believed that the members of the village assembly formed themselves into different committees for the purpose of administration and one of them was known as the Pañchavāra committee. The Masulīpatnam plates of Chālukya Bhīma II (A.D.934-45) refer to the Pañchavāra committee and state that youths eloquent at committee meetings were honoured with the membership on

the committee of five as its members by the chief people of the village. It is evident that the choosing of a person to serve on the Pañchavāra committee was considered a great honour. The great men of the village assembly were selected as the members of the committee. These members were selected from the Mahājanas. They were called Vāra-pramukha or Vāriya-pperumakkal in Tamilnāḍu. The Pañcavārim of the Masulīpaṭnam plates was the same as the Pañchavāravāriyam of the Uttaramērūr records (EI, XXIII, pp.22-28).

SECTION: 5

OFFICIALS OF THE VILLAGE

There were a number of servants in every village, who received mānyams (tax-free lands), mēras and mirāsis (fees) for their services rendered to the village community. The headman of the village was variously known as Grāmani, Grāmika, Grāmīnuḍu, Grāmādhipa, Raṭṭaḍi, Pedda-kāpu, Grāmavibhuḍu, Gāuṇḍa, Prabhu, Grāmasvāmi, Modili Nāyaka and Rāshṭrakūṭa. Reḍḍi was used frequently in the epigraphs as the village headman. He was also known as Grāmakūṭa, from which Gauḍa is derived. Reḍḍi is a Telugu variant of the Sanskrit Rāshṭrakūṭa.

It may be mentioned that the village servants were known as the āyagārs. They were called so because they held āyams. Generally their number was twelve. But their number depended on the exigencies of work, rural economy and the size of the village. In some of the villages, the duties and functions of more than one servant were united in the same person. The origin of the āyagār system is difficult to trace. Dr.N.Venkataramanayya (1935, p.161) opines that it was in full force during the period of the Kākatīyas. Inscriptions show that the āyagār system existed in the country during the period

under study and continued to be so even afterwards. The āyagārs were the village servants rather than the servants of the government. Inscriptions refer to the following officials of the village.

The Reḍḍi

He was the headman of the village. He was also the chief executive of the village assembly. He was the pivot of the village administration. His office was known as raṭṭaḍikamu or raḍḍikamu or grāmakūṭatvamu or grāmanīsvāmitvamu or rāshṭrakūṭam. His office was acquired in different ways. It was acquired by an individual who founded a village, as stated in the Local Records. When a group of agricultural families came together, cleared the forest and formed a new settlement, their leader who had significant influence among the elders of the group, approached the king with presents and obtained the sanction for his acting as the Reḍḍi of the new village. Sometimes, he was appointed by the ruler; if not, his office was to be confirmed by the government. He held one or more villages under his control (SII, X, No. 112). There were instances of there being more than one headman in one village (SII, IV, No.1186). The following are a few instances.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	Reḍḍikam
1.	Kaluchumbaṛṛu	Amma II A.D.945-970)	The office of the Grāmakūṭa of this village was granted to Kusumāyudha by the king.
2.	Bezawāḍa	S.1037	Kulōttunga I granted the roddikam of Begawāḍa to Bhangena Bhīma as a reward for his service (mechi-

		Bezawāḍa-reḍḍikambu-dayacēsina).
3. Dāvulūru	S.1054	Kommana Nāyaka was granted reḍḍikamu of Dāvulūru by Velanāṭi Goṅkarāja.
4. Anantapūr	S.1109	Refers to the conferment of the reḍḍirikamu right over Dharmavaram in equal shares on two families by Tipparājayya, the subordinate ruler at Guṭṭi.
5. Anantapūr	S.1230	The gauḍike of the village Dēvarāyapura was granted to Sādara Muddumalla by Tirumala Sōmayajin. The āyagārs for the new village were appointed in the presence of the residents of four villages.
6. Anantapūr	S.1273	Peda Chōḍamareḍḍi was granted the gauḍirike of the villages, Nasana, Muttavakula, Gauragiri, Kañchikuṇṭa, Valūru and Kētakuṇṭa by Bukkarāya.
7. Nasanakōṭa	S.1273	Refers to the conferment of the gauḍirike right over the village of Nasana to Pedachōḍamareḍḍi by Bukkarāya.
8. Pyālakurti	S.1310	Timireḍḍi was granted the reḍḍirikam of the villages Pālakurti and Sūrabōyinipāḍu for having colonised some families in the uninhabited

UNIVE...

tract of Yādavapuram and Drōnāchalam at the instance of the king Sāluva Narasiṁha.

-.-

Reḍḍikamu was hereditary. The Kalachuṁbarṟu grant of the Eastern Chālukya king Amma II (A.D.945-970) refers to the office of the reḍḍikam which was made in perpetuity. Sometimes, it was sold by its holders. A record from Drākshārāma of S.1075 states that four Brāhmins, who held the right of raṭṭaḍikamu of Anḍamūru with the eight fold enjoyments, sold it to the temple of Bhīmēśvara at Drākshārāma for 120 māḍas.

He discharged a variety of functions. He was a representative of the government and of the people. He was responsible for the village administration. He should be alert in protecting the villagers. Dr.N. Venkataramanayya (Studies, p.161) writes that the main duty of the village headman was the collection of revenue payable by the village community to the king. The following examples show that the village headman had a voice in the collection of taxes. An undated record from Bichagānipalle says that Mummaḍi Reḍḍi, the agent of Pedirājaya, and the Gāunḍa (headman) and Sēnabōva (accountant) of Ūtukūru granted exemption to the Bestabōva community (fishermen) from fishing taxes. Another undated record from Kārumañchi states that the Gāunḍas and the Prajas of Kārumañchi made a gift of a portion of the dues payable to the Liṅgada Vīras to the god Bhōgēśvara.

Gifts were made in the presence of the headman. An epigraph from Sanigaram of A.D. 1052 records that the king's subordinate Mahāsāmanta Kākatīya Poḷalarasar after informing the local Gāuṇḍas, and

with the consent of Kāṭeraḍḍi and others of Bezavāṅka, made a gift of twelve house-sites, a ratna and some land to the god Madhupīśvara. An undated record from Pānugallu refers to a gift of two nivartnas of rice field in every village of Kaṅdūr-vishaya with the consent of the grāma-nāyaka by king Toṇḍa. An inscription from Bāsar of S.1070 mentions that Daṇḍanāyaka Mallidēvarasa granted some land, paddy and oil to the god Abhinavakēśavadēva in the presence of five Gāuṇḍas. In this case, the five Gāuṇḍas were acting as the headmen of the village. An undated record from Boddimākala states that while Jñānaśiva Bhaṭara was in charge of the dēva-bhōga lands and Appaṇa was the Gāuṇḍa, a certain Kāgiseṭṭi made a gift to the temple of Kāmēśvara.

Gifts were made by the village headman. An inscription from Kaṁbadūru of A.D.883 mentions that the Gāuṇḍas and the Brāhmins of Belduguṇḍe granted some land to the Āditya temple when Kura-Gāuṇḍa was the perggaḍe (headman). An epigraph in the Hyderabad Museum of A.D. 1134 records gifts of land and money to the god Sōmēśvara by Manneya Malladēvarasa, the Mahājanas, the Prabhus and others. A record from Alaṁpūr of S.989 refers to a gift at the rate of one gadyāṇa for one village in Ayaje-300 to the god Brahmēśvara by the Prabhus of that division.

He organised the public works of the village and looked after the maintenance of tanks by securing funds from the government. A record from Mānepalli of the reign of the Nolaṁba Pallava king Ayyapadēva states that Chōrayya, and the Gāuṇḍas, and Pannasigas of Eraḍumūra obtained the bittuvāṭa from the king for the upkeep of the tank. An inscription from Maḍakasira of A.D. 950 records that Gāuṇḍa

Kādiyaṇṇa and Paḷḷikāṟa Tuvaṇṇa were each granted 3 khaṇḍugas of wet land for repairing the Oḷageṟe tank. An undated epigraph from Lavanūru mentions that Pōḷa-Mambayya and the Gāuṇḍa of the place constructed tanks and a rāchcha (court house).

He built temples and conducted the village activities. An epigraph from Dāvulūru of S.1063 mentions that Kommaya Nāyaka, who was the grāma-vibhuṇḍu (headman) of Kuṟumgallu, consecrated the image of Gōkēśvara and built a temple and maṇḍapa for it at Dāvulūru. A record from Nārṇepāḍu of S.1093 states that Nāmi Nāyaka, who was the Lord of Vallūripura, made a gift of 55 sheep for a perpetual lamp to the god Sōmēśvaradēva at Nārāyaṇapāḍu.

He was an officer on the spot. He discharged certain civil and magisterial duties by settling the village disputes. A record from Gunimorubōgal states that the Mahājanas along with certain Gāuṇḍas, and the ūru consisting of a few other Gāuṇḍas, and the Śaiva teacher Varuṇa Śiva Bhaṭāra of the temple of Noḷambēśvara being together brought about a settlement of distribution of lands below certain specified tanks. An inscription from Aṭakalaguṇḍu of S.1291 refers to the Asaṅkhyāta-Mahāgaṇas and the Gāuṇḍas as witness to the transaction, when Linga-jiyya sold his vritti lands to Nāga-jiyya of Dēvanabaṇḍa.

It was his duty to protect the life and property of the villagers. He kept under his control the village militia. He not only protected the village from the attacks of others, but also rewarded those who helped him in this regard. An undated record from Karshanapalle states that the Gāuṇḍas of Muttukūru granted some wet land to the son of a deceased hero. An inscription from Embaḍi of the reign of the Bāṇa king Mahāvali-Bāṇarasa mentions that the king granted

some wet land to a certain Gāuṇḍa on the occasion of a cattle-raid. A record from Dēsirdoḍḍi of the 10th century A.D. refers to the grant of land made in memory of a person who died in a company with the Gāuṇḍa of Ẹdeyūr in a village battle. An epigraph from Donekallu of A.D.1059 mentions that a certain Gāuṇḍa fought and fell dead. His son Māchi-Gāuṇḍa was granted the share of the original land of his father and an addition[illegible]rant of one third share of land.

The Kar[illegible]a

[illegible]e accountant. His office was known as [illegible]am in Andhra was the same as Kulakarṇi of [illegible]tra. His duty was to maintain the village [illegible] Vahi (SII, X, No.586). He prepared the [illegible]lage known as gudikaṭṭu or āyakaṭṭu. He [illegible]ting to the extent of the arable and waste [illegible] fallow lands, the wet and dry lands, the land [illegible]vation, an estimate of the crops grown, the assessment of [illegible] dry and wet crops, the total extent of brahmadēya and dēvadāya lands, taxable and rent-free lands, the village services and all items concerning the administration of the village including public works. He measured the fields, fixed the tax payable by the cultivators and maintained the accounts of the village transactions. In fact, the Reḍḍi and the Karṇam were the principal officers of the village. Any business transacted on behalf of the village community without their approval was invalid and illegal. Dr.N.Venkataramanayya (1935, p.161-162) states that the Reḍḍi and the Karṇam worked together in the collection of state dues, attended to the annual jamābandi and settled the annual accounts of the village.

His office was hereditary. An epigraph from Bhīmavaram (undated) mentions that Karnam Rudraya borrowed from a certain Murāri Mahāreḍḍi four hundred tankas on the security of his office. When the former ~~had~~ failed to redeem his debt, the latter gifted the office of karaṇikam to the temple of Bhīmēśvara on the stipulation that any member of the Rudraya's family could take back the office by depositing five hundred taṅkas with the temple. An inscription from Kāraṁpūḍi of S.1186 refers to Karṇam Anipeddi as pūrvavrittikāḍu, that is, the earlier holder of the office of the Karṇam of Kāraṁpūḍi. A record from Durgi of S.1191 mentions that Karṇam Nāmayya of Durgi made a gift of land from his vritti. An undated record from Pānugallu states that the Karṇam of the place gifted some land to the temple from his vritti. These examples show the hereditary nature of the office of karṇikam.

There were instances of more than one Karṇam in a village. An inscription from Bairānipalli of A.D.1108 refers to two Karṇams of Bekkallu. The chief Karṇam was probably called Pedda Karṇam or Pramukha Karṇam. A record from Kūḍali of S.1320 mentions Pedda Karṇam of Kandanavrōlu. An inscription from Kadparti of A.D. 1005 mentions Pramukha-Karṇam. An epigraph from Ālavānipalle of C.V.E. 34 also refers to Pramukha-Karṇam.

Gifts were made with the knowledge of the Karṇam. A record from Emani of S.1047 and another from Pāmāpuram of S.1200 contain at the end the signatures of the Karṇam of the place. Here, Karṇam acted as a witness to the gifts. Secondly, he should enter the transactions in his records; hence the need for his presence.

He supervised the gifts made to the temples. An undated record from Allūru states that a certain Kōṭilingam gave eight kunchas of dry land, one gorru of wet land and the sandy fields in Allūru for services in the temple. The cultivators who cultivated the sandy fields should pay rent and it was the duty of the Karṇam to collect and give this to the temple for its maintenance. Thus the Karṇam looked after the preservation or maintenance of the gifts made to the temple.

He undertook the construction of ~~the~~ public works. An inscription from Kārampūḍi of S.1186 mentions that Karṇam Annipeddi built the compound wall and ~~of~~ gōpura of the temple. An epigraph from Durgi of S.1191 records that Karṇam Nāmaya, who was the prabhu-mukhya of Nandāpura-agrahāra, consecrated the image of Gōpīnātha at Durgi. A record from Ātmakūr of S.1201 mentions that the Karṇams, Kāpus and others of Jilleri constructed a temple to the god Aḷahapurapatidēva at Ātukur.

The Talāri

He was the village policeman. He was appointed for watch and ward purposes. He was the guardian of the village peace. He worked under the guidance of the village headman. He was also called Talavāra, Talayāri, Kāvali or Āreka. His office was hereditary and was known as talāritanamu, talavārike, or talārikam. He received a fee called talāri-pannu or talāri-kaṭnam or talārikamu-kānīkamu. His duty was to go on rounds both day and night to preserve law and order in the village. He protected the life and property of the villagers. His duty was also to watch the movements of the vagabonds, bring the offenders to the village court and report about the persons of bad character (History, p.221).

The Bāri-Kāpu

The Bāri-kāpu protected the village and the fields from the wild beasts, theives and enemies. Talāri and Bāri-kāpu were police servants of the village. While the Talāri did the work of internal watch, the Bāri-kāpu was responsible for the external watch of the village (History, p.222).

The Purōhit

The Brāhman purōhit, a learned and respected person, helped the villagers in several ways. His office was called paurōhityamu. He was also an astrologer. He was consulted by one and all about auspicious time for undertaking an important work. The village servants, the goldsmith, the blacksmith, the carpenter, the potter, the washerman, the barber and the astrologer ~~known as the āyagārs~~ worked together in the village. They served as a link connecting the village folk with the government and their officials.

Their Remuneration

The officials of the village received a fee or āya, from which the name āyagār is derived. As an alternative to the āya, they received inām lands (rent-free lands) mēras and mirāsis (fees). These fees were also known as kāṇāchis. So they were called kāṇāchigāras. A record from Rāvulacheṛuvu of S.1109(?) refers to the appointment of the āyagārs in the village Dharmavaram and the gifts of lands granted to them by Bukkarāya. An epigraph from Anantapūr of S. 1120(?) mentions that a certain Bommanāyaka with the permission of Bukkarāya, appointed kāṇāchigāras in the village Māḍasamudram, which he had founded. An inscriptiom from Madanapalle

of S.1283 records that mēra, mirāsis and other service ināms were granted to the village servants in the village Kasunūru. An epigraph from Anantapūr of S.1270 refers to the specified portions of land granted to the village servants. An undated record from Nalajanapāḍu mentions that a gift of some land was made to the village chief Bādirāju as his hereditary land. A record from Pedakoṇḍūru of S.1239 refers to the talāri-pannu in the 18 villages of the Koṇḍūru-sthala. Another record from Maddipāḍu of A.D.1275 mentions talārikamu-kāṇikamu. An undated record from Pāṇem mentions kāvali-kaṭnam (talāri fee).

SECTION: 6

FUNCTIONS OF THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY

From every early times, the local bodies carried on the functions like construction and maintenance of public works, such as temples, tanks, gardens, wells, halls, satras, etc., collection of taxes payable to the government and administration of justice. In pre-Vijayanagara Karnāṭaka, the village assemblies carried out these functions. In pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra also, the people governed themselves by means of their assemblies in villages and towns as shown below.

The following statements indicate the powers and functions of the village assembly. "If we, the assembly should fail (to fulfil the contract), we shall incur all the sins committed between the (river) Gaṅgā and (Cape) Kumāri" (I.A, 40, p.110). "We, the assembly of this town, ordered that all the oil-mills existing in this village shall (henceforth) be set up on this land, and a portion of the oil (compressed in them) shall be obtained for the lamp" (IA, 40, p.111).

We, the Eighteen castes, having assembled together, made this gift of land free from taxes and miscellaneous fees to the deity (NDI,11, 58). "We, the men of the district (nādu), the villagers and the heads of assemblies, agreed to give the god...35 kalañji of gold . . . ." (NDI, 1,G.54).

The Assembly as a Bank

A socio-economic feature of the medieval period was the numerous gifts made by philanthropic persons for the conduct of various public works in villages and towns. The local bodies took care of these gifts in order to provide the people with certain amenities. The assembly functioned like a bank receiving cash gifts from individuals and utilising the money for the purpose indicated by the donors. A record from Srīkūrmam of S.1071 refers to a gift of five mādas by Pūrnakōṭi with the stipulation that for the interest (poli) on the five mādas the village assembly (Ī-ūri-vāru-poli-naḍapaṁgalavāru) should maintain a lamp in the temple of Srīkūrmadēva. An epigraph from Rellivalasa of S.1075 states that Eṛapōtanāyaka entrusted the assembly with a gift of five mādas (ūri-Vasamunaṁ-beṭṭina-māḍalu-5) for maintaining a perpetual lamp in the temple of Chōḷagaṅga-Mādhavādēva. An inscription from Mahadēvamaṅgalam of the reign of Parakēsarivarman mentions that the assembly of Māvalimaṅgalam in Tūnāḍu agreed to conduct some charity (name missing) with the gold it had received from a certain Vāiramēgan, the headman of Kuruvili. These examples show that the assembly received money not only for the conduct of public services but also as deposits on interest.

In some instances, the rate of interest which the assembly had to pay was fixed. An inscription from Guḍimallam of S.827 records

that Kadigai Tāli, the headman of Vīramangalam made a gift of gold (20 kalañju) for a lamp, fixing the interest on the gold four kalañjus per year at the rate of four mañjādis for each kalañju (this comes to twenty per cent of interest per annum). The assembly should purchase with this money 180 nālis of ghee at the rate of 45 for a kalañju accrued on the amount it received at the rate of 1 uri per day. Another inscription from the same place of S.820 refers to the gift of gold (30 kalañju) for a lamp and offerings, entrusted to the assembly on condition to pay interest. A record from Kālahasti of A.D.1016 refers to the gift of gold (6 kalañju) for a lamp, fixing the interest 1 3/4 kalañju and one mañjādi per year at the rate of a kunri per kalañju per month, which works out to 30 per cent, a rather heavy rate of interest.

Village Lands

The village assembly had the right to acquire land and it could sell or grant the same for any act of public utility. Sometimes, land gifts were made by the king or his officers or the village assembly or the village assembly and officers jointly or individuals with the consent of the village assembly or the village assembly and other village corporations jointly. The following examples will show these functions of the village assembly.

1. Allūru village, situated in Ongōle district, had an assembly. In A.D.1317 Gālamuddana Bōyindu and Dana Mādhava gave as charity 50 kuntas of land and one kunchadu of ghee per month for a lamp in the presence of Pinnaya Venkamgāru, the governor, the Reddis, the Karnams and the Samasta-praja of Aralūru with their approval.

2. The assembly of Bhīmavaram (West Gōdāvari) had an executive which was referred to as Ūrināyakulu. In S.1099 its members along with the Srīvaishnavulu granted as vritti one house site, four kha of chavuka-bhūmi and four kha of garuvu-bhūmi to one Akkasāla Pōtōju for his service to the village community.

3. China Kandukūru (Khammam district) had an assembly of 60 households. Sāvāsi Ravva Battu and the 60 Ēitīlu of the village together gave 3 marturus of land for monthly expenditure of food and light for the shrine of Srī Bhōganātha and the rest of the land for the deity's anga-ranga bhōga. In A.D. 1243 the sixty members of the assembly made one adda of land behind the Chākikunta-tank with the produce of both the kārtis for the naivēdya of Rāmēśvaradēva and Bhōganāthadēva.

4. Ganapavaram (Guntūr district) had an assembly known as Ūriprajalu. It made a gift of some land to the temple builder Kāmōju as his hereditary inām land for the merit of the king Kulōttunga Rājēndra Chōda.

5. Gōtūru, situated in Cuddapah district, had an assembly of 18 Prajas, headed by two persons, Namvi Reddi and Papi Reddi. In S.1319 Mahāmandalēśvara Apratimalla Gangaya Dēvachōda Mahārāja made a gift of land with the consent of the assembly to Kāsa Chāmāya-battudu, who had constructed the temple of god Bhairavadēva at Gōtūru. In S.1342, Mahāmandalēśvara Ūbalayya Dēvachōda Mahārāja, son of the above donor, made some gift of land to the god Bhairavadēva. The assembly of the 18 Prajas headed by Akkam Bayirapa Reddi and Mutyāla Bairapa Reddi approved the gift and also renewed the previous grant of land. This indicates that this particular piece of land was under the absolute control of the

village assembly.

6. Kālahasti, situated in Chittoor district, had an assembly. In the 47th year of Kulōttuṅga Chōḷadēva, a certain Kaliṅgarāsar, the headman of Arumbākkam made a gift of land which he had purchased ~~it~~ from the village assembly of Nilaikadaṟpākkam in peruṁbēḍu, a subdivision of Payyūr Kōṭṭam, a district of Jayangoṇḍa Chōla maṇḍalam for maintaining a maṭha for the āṇḍār (servants), who served in the temple.

7. Karavaḍi situated on the southern bank of the Guṅdēru in Oṅgōle district had an assembly of 18 castes. In S. 1232 Kāmaya Boppaṇḍu, Dēvaya Reḍḍigāru, the Reḍḍis, the Kāpus, and the seṭṭis, and the 18 castes assembled together to present a gift to the deity Rāmanātha at Kaṟuvaḍi. The meeting records, "We have given the field to the deity free from taxes and miscellaneous fees". This indicates that the assembly collected taxes on land.

8. An inscription from Maḍakasira of S.872, mentioned earlier, refers to an assembly of the residents of the four villages, which granted 3 khaṇḍugas of paddy field to Gāvuṇḍa Kāḍiyanna and to Paḷḷikāṟa Tuvaṇṇa for their having constructed a tank at Sivari, a village in Chiripi twelve.

9. Mahādēvamaṅgalam, situated in Chittoor district, had an assembly. In the 16th year of Chōḷa Rājarājakēsarivarman, a certain Piṭṭaṉ Īyapirāṉ of Manaṟpākkam made a gift of land, after its purchase from the assembly of Māvalimaṅgalam, for srībali, lamps and special offerings in the temple of Tirukkaṇḍīśvaram Uḍaiyār in the village.

10. Nāgulapāḍu (Nalgoṇḍa district) had an assembly of 18 communities. In A.D. 1303 the assembly of the 18 communities made the vritti for service to the god Malnātha at Nāgulapāḍu at the rate of an aḍugu for one marturu of ploughed land together with mānyas (land given) for house sites (sthāna-nivēsanas).

11. An inscription from Naḍigūḍemu of S.1222 refers to the assembly of Tāḍivāya-samasta-praja and Nēlamaṟṟi-samasta-praja. The assembly made a gift of some lands, garden and money to the god Chenna Mallikārjuna for the merit of Mahāsāmanta Cheṟuku Jagaddāḷu Māraya Gaṇapaya Reḍḍi (the governor). In S.1236 Mahāsāmanta Cheṟuku Jagadāḷa Annama Reḍḍi and another Reḍḍi (local officers) made a gift of land for service to god Mailāradēva at Tāḍivāya with the consent of the assembly of the people of Tāḍuvāyi (Krishna district).

12. Pāmulapāḍu (Pāmulapāṭi) (Gunṭūr district) had an assembly known as Samasta-Praja. Velanāṭi Rājēndra Chōḍa and the assembly of the Pāmulapāṭi-samasta-praja made a gift of land free of taxes to the temple at Pāmulapāḍu in the Koṇḍapaḍumaṭi country.

13. Two records (undated, 1 and 2) refer to the sale of land by the village assembly of Tiruttani (Chittoor district) to the temple. Another (undated-3) record also refers to the sale of land by the assembly of Jananātha-Chaturvēdimaṅgalam to a private person for feeding pilgrims going back and forth to Śrīveṅkaḍam.

14. An inscription from Tiruvālaṅgāḍu (A.D. 1118) (Chittoor district) refers to the sale of land by the village of Pollipākkam to a merchant. In this case, the village assembly sold its land.

15. An undated record from Ramēśvaramu in Cuddapah district mentions that the people granted one and half kuṇṭa of dry field to a carpenter for his service in the temple. In this instance, the village assembly made the gift of its own land.

16. Guḍimallam, situated in Chittoor district, had an assembly, which discharged several functions. Two (undated, 1 and 2) records refer to land gifts made by the members of the village assembly. The first of them was made for the purpose of digging pits in the village and depositing the silt on the local bund.

17. The assembly of Nemali (Chittoor district) discharged several functions. In the 13th year of the Chōḷa Pārakēsarivarman, the sabhā of Nemali made a gift of land free of taxes for service and a lamp in the temple. In the 28th year of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Kannaradēva, the sabhā of Nemali made a remission of taxes on 100 kuḷi of land granted for sounding music during the Srībali service in the temple of Tirumeṟṟali Perumāḷ.

18. Tumbalam, (Kurnool district) had an assembly of 140 Mahājanas. A record from Peddatumbalam of A.D.1106 registers that Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Mallarasa made a gift of land for service in the temple of god Karekanthēśvara. The Mahājanas of the village Tumbuḷa also made some contributions out of the toll-revenue of the village for the service of the same god. A record from Chinnatumbuḷam of A.D.1142 mentions that the Mahājanas of Tumbaḷam made a grant of some land for the service of the god Kēśavadēva. A record from Peddatumbaḷam of A.D. 1148 refers to the vrittis, granted to the Brāhmaṇas, and they were not saleable. Some of the Brāhmaṇas are called Arasas and Nāyakas, though they were observing Vedic rites. They were

ready for taking weapons or to act as pious priests. They made a gift to the keeper of the sacred fire. A record from Bāpuram of A.D.1172 states that the Mahājanas of Tumbaḷam, who possessed royal honours, made a gift of land for the service of the god Chennabīyāḷa-Sōmanātha. The Mummuridaṇḍas of Tumbaḷa also ~~made~~ collected a cess on their commercial articles for the service of the same god. Mahāpradhāni Kariyakēsarirājayya was the governor of Sindavāḍi one thousand. An inscription from Chinnatumbaḷam of A.D.1229 records that when Murārikēśava was the governor of the Sindavāḍi-vishaya, Anantapriya set up the god Yōga Narasimhadēva at Tumbaḷa. The Mahājanas made a gift of some plots of land for the service of the god.

Hero-stones

In some instances, land gifts were made to the heirs of those who had fought for their village and died for it. These deaths arose out of dispute either to boundaries, water or cattle raids. They are commemorated on monuments known as Hero-stones. A record from Bōdināyanipalle of S.886 states that the king Vajjaladēva and the village people made a gift of land in memory of a hero (name lost), who had died in a cattle-raid at Mangala. Aanther undated record from the same place mentions that the king Vajjaradēva and the village people of Mangala made a gift of land under the tank called Baḍamgāni-kaṟe as kalnāḍu in memory of Hengilakusiya who died in a cattle-raid. An epigraph from Tangeḍa of S.1450 refers to the grant of land by the inhabitants of the 44 villages to two individuals (names missing) for having defended the fort-gate (during some attack). An undated inscription from Buḍidepalle mentions an attack on Pulināḍu in which Miniki fought and died. The Bāna king

Mahāvali Vāṇarasa granted Minuki to the hero's family. An undated record from Vurukuṇḍa registers that a tiger having entered the town, a certain Bayirā-Vīruḍu attacked it and died. Rāmati Koṇḍrāju granted his family 3 tūms of rēgaḍa land.

Village Taxes

The village assembly exercised powers of taxation. It performed the duty of collecting taxes and paying them to the treasury. It maintained the accounts of the revenue transactions of the village. Remission of taxes or their assignment for expenses of the temple or individuals ~~were~~ was communicated by the government to the assembly for necessary action. The village assembly carried on certain revenue transactions, as the following examples will show.

1. The record from Naḍigūḍem of S.1222 mentions that the residents of Tāḍuvāya and Nelamaṟṟi assigned to the temple of Chenna-Mallikārjuna two vīsas in every māḍa of the income of the above villages respectively.

2. The inscription from Tēkmal of S.1230 mentions the gift of the cash income of land tax of the village of Tēkumbeḍla to Bhōganātha by Mahāpradhāni puravari Mahādēva Nāyaka with the consent of the eighteen communities of the place.

3. The epigraph from Karavaḍi of S.1232 refers to a gift of some land to the god Rāmanātha free from taxes and miscellaneous fees by the assembly of Kāmaya Boppaṇḍu, Dēvayareḍḍigāru, the Reḍḍis, the Kāpus, the seṭṭis and the 18 communities.

4. The record from Māṭeḍu of S.1232 states that all the 18 Prajas of Mēṭeḍu village made the gift of Siddhāyamu at the rate of 5 vīsam to one māḍa to Mūlasthānamu Mallaeśvaradēva and Kēśavadēva.

5. The epigraph from Malaceruvu of S.1233 refers to a fixed rate of contribution of one cinnamu for a putti for all bags of grain sown on all wet land and dry land including the king's land (rācapolamu) to Svayambhudēva by all the people.

The following are a few examples of exemptions from taxes made with the consent of the village assembly.

1. The inscription from Bichagānipalle, already referred to, mentions that Mummadi Reddi, the agent of Pedirājayya, and the Gāunda and the Sēnabōva of Utukūru granted the exemptions of fishing taxes to the fishermen community.

2. The record from Makhtal of A.D.1321 refers to Singanādamu-pannu granted to Kodamgi Simgena by Gumdaya-Nāyanimgāru and Pradhāni Komdanāyamkulu respectively with the consent of all the Samayas, together with the Srī Vaishnava-samaya, that is, the 18 samayas.

3. An inscription from Kotipi of S.1354 records the remission of the marriage tax on all castes at Kotapi by the local officers.

4. An epigraph from Nilaru of the time of Chālukya Satyāsraya states that the king remitted certain taxes due from some Gāundas (named).

The village assembly had the right to fix a tax. It imposed taxes and collected them for service in the temple.

1. An epigraph from Tangeda of S.1230 mentions a tax fixed on all sales in the town at the rate of a vīsam per māda of the sale price to the temple of Rāmanātha by the 18 Samayas and the merchants of Tangeda.

2. An inscription from Kokkirēni of S.1236 refers to a tax levied on people of several castes by the assembly of the samasta-praja.

3. A record from Medikonduru of S.1240 mentions that the Kapus and the eighteen communities of the place agreed to pay a visa of their income to the god Prasannagopinatha.

These examples indicate that the village assembly was associated with the government in its revenue administration. It safeguarded the interests of the village community and acted as an agent of the Government. As a body of the people, it enjoyed the right to levy and make contributions in cash and kind on local sales and purchases, as well as on members of the communities. It also gifted away a part of the tax-income or a part of the corporate property in land. Thus it was the connecting link between the people and the government.

Fines as source of income

In addition to the land and cash gifts, the village assembly secured funds by other means for the conduct of public services. One source was the collection of certain fines in the village. A Khājipet epigraph of A.D. 932 refers to certain fines for specified offences. A Bōdan inscription of A.D. 1056 records that " for transgression of orders (shall be levied) a fine of 52 black dramma; one who seizes, shall pay a fine of 12 dramma; one who draws the dagger, a fine of 1,000 dramma; one stabs, a fine of 96 dramma. This custom shall be maintained without fail". A Korawi record of the time of Chālukya Bhīma I mentions fines for certain crimes. A sum of twenty-five drammas was to be paid as fine for cutting off the nose, adbuction, drawing of the sword, theft and adultery. For the crime committed by a man, the fine is the forfeiture of his jīvana (means of livelihood). In addition to these, dues such as variyārambha, paduvārambha, vellāramba (one era-gadyāṇa) and the tax

UNIVE... (stamp)

of five hundred drammas had to be paid at the time of full-moon day. No one, whether he was a Nāyaka or Kāpu should join the alien king. A record from Alampūr of A.D.1107 registers that Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Mallarasa, lord of the town of Kōḍūr, granted a gift of the income accruing from taxes and fines collected in the village of Kurnool (Kandanavoḷal) to the god Brahmēsvara at Alampūr. An inscription from Yelañji of S.1478 records that Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Rāmarāju Viṭṭalarāja Tirumalirājayyadēva Mahārāja, the local governor, directed that the fines, etc., collected in the village should be utilised for repairing temples, tanks, etc. It is evident that these fines were collected for specified crimes in villages and the amount so collected was utilised for public services by the village assembly with the approval of the local officers.

Irrigation Tax

Another source of income was an irrigation tax. A record from Khājipet of the time of Vikramāditya VI (A.D.1076-1126) refers to certain regulations for the collection of cess on quamtities of water supplied from the tank for irrigating the lands. Land gifts were also made for the maintenance of tanks, as noted elsewhere.

Public works

(A) Temples

The village assembly looked after the maintenance of temples. Several gifts made to temples have already been referred to. The following examples will show that the villagers either constructed temples or made gifts for their maintenance.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	Gift
1.	Bāsar	S.1070	The Gaundas and the merchants made a gift of land for the worship and offerings of the god Kēśava.
2.	Bhōgapuram	S.1100	A merchant, Kannama Nāyaka constructed the Jain temple at Bhōgapuram and gave two puttis of of land with the consent of the Dēśi-Rattadlu (the agricultural community of the place).
3.	Gangavaram	S.1179	The people granted the village to the local god.
4.	Ātmakūr	S.1201	A certain Mahārāja, the Kāpus and Karnams of Jilleri constructed a temple to Alahapurapatidēva at Ātmakūr.
5.	Vurukunda	S.1328	The residents of the village Vurukunda and Avabalarāja, the local officer, constructed the temple of Hanumantha.
6.	Inkollu	S.1333	Records the construction of the temple and mandapa of the god Kēśavaperumāl by several individuals of Inkollu.
7.	Gangāpūr	C.V.E.28	The inhabitants of the place made a gift to god Halēśvaradēva.

8. Ammanabrōlu	Undated	The Kāpus of Ammanabrōlu, the Karnams and others had agreed that the lands cultivated under the tank were to be taxed at the rate of three tūms on every putti of produce for service to god Kēśava.
9. Duvva	Undated	The villagers and the local officials agreed to pay for daily service of the gods Gōpālaswāmi, Kēśavarāya, Pallakēśava and Hanuman at Duvva.
10. Srīraṅgapuram	Undated	The people of Raṅgasamudram, the Gāuṇḍas, Sēnabōvas, the āyagārs and the Pārapatya Timmapayya, the agent of Timmana Nāyaka constructed the temple of Basaliṅgadēva and granted land for service in the temple.

(B) Tanks

The village assembly took care of tanks. It secured funds from the government or individuals and made provision for the maintenance of tanks. The construction of the numerous tanks or gifts for their maintenance will show the philanthropic zeal of the people, who ~~had~~ considered the tank construction a sacred deed and a meritorious service.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	Gifts to tanks
1.	Anumakonda	of the time of Bēta	Refers to the construction of two Tanks, Kēsari-samudramu and Setti-Kereya.
2.	Manepalle	Nolamba Pallava king	The village heads of Eradumūra obtained the bittuvāta from the Nolamba Pallava king Ayyapadēva for the upkeep of the tank.
3.	Gunimorubāgal	A.D.936	The Stānapati, Gāundas and others gave land for the upkeep of the tank.
4.	Madakasira	A.D.950	Mallana Sivari, the governor, and the inhabitants of the 4 villages made land for repairing the Olagere tank.
5.	Kambadūr	A.D.965	King Polalchōradēva made bittuvāta for the repairs of the Beldugunde tank and ordered the 106 Gāundas to take care of the tank.
6.	Nārnepādu	S.1073	Mandadi Kommana peggade, lord of Origandipura, built the tank called Drōnasamudramu.
7.	China Kandukūr	S.1214	Sāvāsi Ravvabattu and sixty Eiti men built a tank.
8.	Arikela	S.1314	Balapa Nāyaka, a local officer, granted some money income to

		Saṅga-Gauḍa, who constructed the Kannageṟe tank at Arekeṟe in Kilināḍu.
9. Alajanēru	Undated	One Dēśabōya was granted land free of tax for having closed up a breach in the tank and also to do repairs of the tank in future at Aḷinjamēri by two persons.
10. Badikāyalapalle	Undated	Raghunāyakulu, a governor, granted rent-free ten tūms of wet land for the maintenance of a tank. In this case, the village Assembly looked after the care of the tank.

(c) Well (Nūyi) and Kalugāḍi

Care was taken to provide the people with the amenity of a well for the purpose of supplying fresh water. A few examples may be given.

1. A record from Moripirāla of S.1103 refers to the construction of a well in the temple of Pōlēśvara.

2. An epigraph from Guḍilavāḍa of S.1159 mentions that Pōtabōyuṇḍu constructed a well with bricks (eṭika-nūyi) and a kalu-gāḍi (a stone trough or tub intended to store water for the purposes of drinking water by the cattle) at Guḍivāḍa. He also gave land to those who keep water in the tub (vāriki-jītānakani-kumṭa-cēnu-icchenu). Another name to kalugāḍi was dharmagāḍi (HAS, 19 No.41, S.1202) or aḍḍagāḍi (WDI, No.74)

3. An inscription from Bairāmpalle of C.V.E. 36 refers to a

village well known as ūra-rātnamu.

4. One record from Jammikunṭa (A.D. 995), another from Potlapalli (S.998) and two from Sanigaram (S.1050 and A.D.1107) refer to the gifts of rātna (mōṁta) made to temples.

(D) Water-sheds (Chalivaṁdiri)

The following are a few examples of water-sheds.

(1) An inscription from Pillalamarri of S.1130 mentions a Chalivaṁdiri and the gift of land to a person for supplying water.

(2) A record from Jalālupuram of S.1175 refers to the construction of Chalivaṁdiri.

(3) An epigraph from Dharmasāgar of the time of Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva mentions the grant of some land to Chalipandiri (shed where drinking water was served to the thirsty).

(4) A record from Pedda Gārlapāḍu of S. 1183 refers to a gift of land made to a water-pandal (or Chalipaṁdiri HAS, 13, No.39).

(5) An inscription from Voppicherḷa of S.1221 records that the residents of Voppicherla instituted a charity for supply free water to men and cattle in the village. They also granted land as endowment to the persons employed in supplying water.

(6) An undated epigraph from Pātapalle refers to the construction of a water-shed.

(7) A record from Arsavilli of the 58th year of Anaṁtavarma refers to the construction of a Calivaṁdiri and a gift of land for its maintenance.

These examples indicate the care taken to supply water not only for men and cattle of the village but also for travellers to quench their thirst. The water-shed was not only a place where

travellers could rest a while on their journey~~. As the land granted in the record of Arasavilli was entrusted to the learned Brāhmins, evidently it was a place of learning and~~ but was also a common place serving the needs of the people.

(E) Gardens

There are a few examples of donations of gardens.

(1) A record from Vēmulavāḍa of A.D. 1106 refers to the gift of a flower-garden to the god Arikēśavadēva and mentions a certain Māchigaṅga who was the garland maker of that garden.

(2) A record from Śripuram of S.1093 refers to the grant of a garden, etc., made to the god Rāmēśvara by the Reḍḍis of Siripuram.

(3) An inscription from Moripirāla of S.1103 mentions a mango garden having been presented to the temple of Pōtēśvara.

(4) An epigraph from Duggirāla of S.1198 refers to a gift of flower garden made by some individuals with the consent of all the villagers.

(F) Feeding-houses (satra or dharma-satramu)

Gifts were also made for the maintenance of feeding houses. Provision for food free of cost was arranged for sanyasins, students, pilgrims and others. A person who looked after a feeding house was called satramaṭhapati or satrādhikāri (superintendent of the choultry). A few examples follow.

(1) An epigraph of the time of Chālukya Arikēsari from Vēmulavāḍa registers a gift of land for a satra (feeding-house) in the temple of Āditya.

(2) A record from Agastyēśvaram of S.910 and another of the time of Chālukya Jagadekamalla (Ś.955-960), and the third of S.973

mention a feeding-house and the gift of villages (named) for its maintenance.

(3) An inscription from Drākshārāma of the time of Kūlōttunga Rājēndra Chōḍa mentions a grant of cows, gardens, etc., for feeding sanyāsins (bhōjanaṁ-tapassulaku-āchandrārkamu-naḍuchunaṭlugā-nītōṭa-icci).

(4) An epigraph from Peddakoḍamaguṇḍlu of S.1069 records that the taxes pērusuṅkamu, vaḍḍarāvulamu, kolchu-vīsālu, etc., due from the village of Koḍamagūḍa were assigned for the maintenance of worship in the temples and for the support of sanyāsins and students.

(5) A record from Pillalamarri of S.1130 mentions the gift of land for the maintenance of a satra.

(6) An inscription from Pedda Gārlapādu of S.1133 refers to a gift of land for the maintenance of a feeding-house.

(7) An epigraph from Malyāla of S.1208 mentions a gift of land for maintaining a feeding-house (satra).

(8) A Nandi pillar (near Jūṭūru) of S.1213 makes a reference to a grant of lands for maintaining the satras(charity homes).

(9) A record from Siṁhāchalam of S.1213 refers to the grant of land for providing food in the choultry and the person in charge of it.

(10) An (undated) inscription from Tiruttani mentions a gift of land for feeding pilgrims going back and forth to Śrīveṅgaḍam.

(G) Medical Care

Medical care to the inhabitants was not neglected. Gifts were made to doctors for their service to the village community. An inscription from Kōrukoṇḍa of S.1290 records that Siṅgaya Nāyaka gave

the village of Akkalapuṇḍi to a doctor named Parihitāchārya. An epigraph from Koṇḍavīḍu mentions a gift to Asvavaidyudu, a Veterinary doctor. A record from Pālakōl of S.1222 mentions a doctor dealing with the diseases of horses (Vāsudēva paṇḍitulu-Aśvāyurvēdavēttā).

(H) Public-hall

We have an instance of the construction of a public-hall for the common use of the people. An undated record from Lavanūru refers to the construction of a rāchcha (court-house) by Pōlanaṁbayya and a Gāuṇḍa.

Trusteeship

The village assembly performed the duties of a trustee of the public property. It agreed to look after charitable endowments made by private persons for the common benefit of all villagers. It accepted deposits both in kind and cash for managing the trust on the interest accrued from the deposit. It held in trust lands gifted for charitable institutions. During the medieval period, committees of the village assembly looked after the public works like temples and tanks in Tamilnāḍu. Individuals on behalf of the village assembly looked after the public works in Karnāṭaka. Both the practices existed in pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra regarding the management of public works.

The Telugu words used to denote the trusteeship (dharma-kartrutvamu) are beṭṭina (kept under the care of) naḍupu (provide, execute, to celebrate as per, to carryout, to continue or to supply) and kalayaṁtakālamu (as long as). The expressions are thus (1) kalayaṁtakālamu-naḍupuvāru or naḍapaṁgalavāru (2) Ī-ūri-nāyakulu-āchaṁdrārkamuna-beṭṭu (3) āchaṁdrārkamunaḍapaṁgalavāru

(4) āchaṁdrārkamunaḍipiṁppaṁgalavāru (5) āchaṁdrārka-sthāyigaṁ-jellaṁgalayadi and (6) ūrivasamunaṁ-beṭṭina-datti. In addition to the examples already referred to, a few more are given below.

1. There are instances of one or two persons acting as trustees of endowments on behalf of the assembly. A record from Mukhalingam of S.1107 refers to Nūṁkkināyaku-berasinavāru-āchaṁdrārkamunaḍupaṁgalavāru (Nūṁkki Nāyaka and others will continue this gift). Another record from Siṁhāchalam of S.1129 mentions Ī-yūri-Ellamanāyaku-beracina-nāyakullunu (Ellamanāyaka along with others) will maintain this gift.

2. There are instances of gifts being entrusted to the village assembly without referring to any person. The inference is that the executive of the assembly looked after such gifts. A record from Rellivalasa of S.1075 mentions that those who executed this gift entrusted to the assembly would gain merit in life (Ūrivasamunaṁbeṭṭina-mā-5-Īdīpamunaḍipina-vāru-puṇyamu-poṁduduru).

3. The village assembly acted as a guardian of the public endowments and charities. An undated record from Tiruttani refers to the endowments entrusted to the annual committee of the village assembly. An epigraph from Yogimallavaram of A.D.1229 records the endowment of the taxes collected in kind and cash from the land for the procession during the festival. The Ūravar of Maṇṇaippūṇḍi took over the land, and agreed to remit 100 vaṭṭi of paddy and 4 poṉ as the amount of tax both in kind and cash to be capitalised for the requirements of the festival. A record from Pērūru of A.D.1260 mentions that the Grāmasvāmis were looking after the gift made to the god Śrī Svayaṁbhū Sōmanāthadēva. An inscription from Tiruchchāṉūr of the

12th century refers to the gift of a golden kalaśa and the local authorities who acceptd the gift on behalf of the temple. An undated record from Pētlūru registers a gift of land and states that the gift is to be protected by the Raṭṭoḍi-kāpus of Immalūru.

4. Sometimes, the execution of gifts involved the fulfilment of the stipulations indicated by the donors. A record from Pērūru of A.D.1260 refers to a grant of eleven marturs of land entrusted to the Grāmasvāmis. It states that "from the proceeds of these marturs they had to expend one kuncha of rice, one sōla of ghee, one aḍḍa of curds every day; for mid-day offerings, 3 kunchas of rice, one sōla of ghee, one aḍḍa of curds, one mānika of oil for two sandhya dīpas. Every day this is to be carried on according to this arrangement. For the mid-day offerings to God Kamalēśvara, Dhārēśvara and Mailēśvara 3 kunchas of rice and 1 1/2 sōla of ghee for night offerings. For three evening lamps . . sōlas of oil. Worship must be carried on every day. The Grāmasvāmis who carry on this dharma without fail get immense merit and those who neglect go to endless hell" (Īprakārāna-nīdharmamūm-dappakuṇḍānaḍipeḍu-Grāmasvāmulaku-anantapunyamuphalasiddhi . . upēkshimchirēni akshaya-narakastulu-avutāru). An epigraph from Bairanipalli of A.D.1108 mentions that a certain Daṇḍanāyaka, two Karṇams and twelve Nāyakas of Bhuvanagiri were entrusted with the execution of the charity of Viṭṭakulatilaka Jinālaya of Bakkalla made by Bīrama Reḍḍi for washing, repairs and feeding the monks. The expenses for the maintenance of this talavritti are to be met from the revenues collected as follows": the proceeds from the māvina rāṭna, to the south east of it, 20 marturs of land cultivated from the tank, 2 marturs of wet land (garden, etc.) irrigated in the months of kārtika and vaisākha, coconut grove on the bank of the Paḷāvaḷige

t-937 V LG

tore (stream), one oil mill for nandādīvi; five kolaga (measure) of paddy from the income of each of the looms in the village".

5. We have instances of learned persons (pandituḷu) and the Mahājanas acting as trustees of the endowments. A record from Bāpaṭla of S.1067, another from Dākamarri of S.1071 and the third from Ganikapūḍi of S.1197 support these examples.

6. If the trustee failed in his duty in looking after the charity as per the stipulation, he was asked to pay compensation to make good for the shortage of the stipulated amount of the agreement. An epigraph from Kāḷahasti of A.D.1012 mentions a gift of 15 cows having been made by Sōḷā-Vēḷān in A.D. 1001 and another of 5 cows by Karuppāṟuḍaiyāṉ and members of his family in A.D.1008 to the temple of Tiruhkāḷattimahādēva. The upāsakas agreed to supply ghee and curd as per the terms of the endowments. When they were found lagging behind in supplying the ghee and curd as per the terms accepted by them, the upāsakas agreed to pay a cash compensation of 24 kaḻanju and 2 mā towards the unremitted quantities of 15 kalam of ghee and 44 kalam and 2 tūṇi of curd computed from the date of the agreement to 161st day of the endowments.

Administration of Justice

The village assembly performed the important function of the administration of justice. It settled disputes of villagers and its decisions were approved by the government. The village court was known as Dharmāsana consisting of the chief men of the village and the āyagārs. It was also called Tīrpari-sabhā and its members were known as Tīrparulu.

The village tribunals were recognised in the Smritis and Dharmaśāstra. They state that the Kulas, Śrenis and Gaṇas would decide the disputes of their members. They recommend even the setting up of special tribunals with the elders of the place and also neighbouring places for the settlement of boundary disputes. Epigraphic and literary records of the period refer to the Dharmāsana, the Tīrparulu and the Vidvāṁsulu for the dispensation of justice in towns and villages.

The Dharmāsana discharged judicial functions at several places. Krīḍābhirāmamu mentions a Dharmāsana at Rājahmundry (Kd.Rm., Int.p.63) and at Waraṅgal (Kd.Rm., v. 264). An epigraph from Drākshārāma (SII,iv,No.1352) refers to a certain Dharmāsanaṁ Liṅgaṁbaṭlu. An inscription from Anaṁtapūr of S.1578 (a record of later period cited for elucidation) records an instance of a quarrel, regarding the gauḍike of Role between Annadāna-Gauḍa and Chiga-Mudhaiya, which was submitted to the Dharmāsana. The record states that the village court (dharmāsana), consisting of the chief men of the village and the āyagārs, decided the right of gauḍike of Role in favour of Mudhaiya. The officer at Harati accepted the decision given by the village court and conferred the right of gauḍike on Mudhaiya.

Inscriptions refer to the Tīrparulu as a separate and distinct class of judicial officials. They appear to have settled disputes of villagers in general. An inscription from Guḍivāḍa of S.1158 mentions Tīrpari Nāmi Reḍḍi. An epigraph from Tripurāṁtakam of S.1218 refers to Tīrparulu, who joined with other professionals of the place to make a gift to the temple of Tripurādevi. A record from Siṁhāchalam of S.1321 mentions Tīrpari Keśamaseṭṭi. Another one from the same place of S.1322 refer to Tīrpari Gangiseṭṭi.

Vidvāṅsulu were also judicial officials who were probably in the court of the king. Vidvāṅsulu denoted 'learned men'. They dispensed justice just as the logicians did as the members of Dharmāsana at Rājahmundry (Kd. Rm., p.37). An inscription from Nandalūr of S.1231 mentions an instance of a dispute settled by the Vidvāṅsulu. It states that the Mahājanas of Nandalūr made an appeal to the king Kākatīya Pratāparudradēva regarding the unjust collection of certain taxes from the five villages (named) belonging to them. The king referred the issue to the Vidvāṅsulu at his court, who enquired the matter and gave their decision in favour of the Mahājanas. The king then issued orders to stop the collection of all such taxes (collected by previous rulers) which the Mahājanas were not entitled to pay.

The judges were paid remuneration in the form of vrittis of land for settling disputes of the villagers. For example, Dharmāsanam Liṅgambaṭlu made a gift of land from his vritti to the temple at Drākshārāma. An inscription from Sarpavaram of S.1334 refers to the grant of land which the judges received for their service.

Three methods were adopted for the settlement of boundary disputes, such as (1) examination of evidence (2) examination of witness and (3) trial by ordeal. Disputes were settled by negotiations, official intervention and selecting a person to mark the boundary by treading.

The following are a few examples.

1. Generally, disputes were settled amicably in the village itself. They were settled in the presence of the elders. That is, the elders of the village constituted the village court. An

inscription from Kodavalūru of S.1190 mentions that the children of Nāraparāju and Appalarāju made a partition of the vrittis in the presence of the elders of the village known as Mahājanulu. An epigraph from Pushpagiri of S.1222 records an agreement among the temple priests regarding their vrittis in the presence of the Mahājanas of the Pañchamaṭha-sthānas of Pushpagiri and the Samasta-Praja (all the people of the place). An undated record from Yādiki refers to the settlement of a dispute by the elders of Pāmiḍi relating to a monetary transaction. It states that the documents executed by Narāri Raṁgayya having been tempered with by him, Gutti Peda-Narasiṁgaya got the dispute settled at Pāmiḍi and had the documents cancelled. An inscription (undated) from Yerraguḍi mentions internal disputes and their settlement by the elders of the village by a mahāśāsana.

2. Disputes regarding irrigation rights or distribution of lands were settled by the village assembly. An inscription from Gunimorubāgal of S.858 refers to the settlement of distribution of lands below certain specified tanks by the Mahājanas along with certain Gāuṇḍas, the Ūru and the Śaiva teacher Varuna Śiva Bhaṭāra. An epigraph from Chellūru of S.1431 mentions an agreement among the residents of the three villages, Maḍaiviḷāgam, Sīlaiyūr (Chellūru) and Kanḍāḍu regarding the right of irrigation from the channel called Sadāśiva-kōna.

3. Disputes were settled with the help of the elders of neighbouring villages. A C.P. inscription from Karīmnagar of A.D. 1246 refers to the settlement of a dispute regarding the right on Gonugu-kāluva of Chāmanapalli. The record states that Maṁchirāja the minister of Jāyapanāyaka at the order of Gaṇapatidēva came to

Chāmanapalli, invited the elders of Kummari-kunta, Dēwanapalli and Katyakōlapalli, assembled them near the canal and asked them for their evidence. The witnesses (elders) said that the Gonugu-kāluva belonged to the Chāmanapalli village. The minister accepted the evidence and the king conferred the right of Gonugu-kāluva on the Brāhmins of Chāmanapalli.

4. There were instances of the settlement of land disputes. An inscription from Donekallu of A.D.1059 states that two Brāhmins, Ciddayya and Jakkayya occupied by force the umbali land of three Gāundas, Nijjara-Gāunda, Chaliki-Gāunda and Chandaya-Gāunda. The Gāundas, having decided to attack the Brāhmins to regain the land, resolved that in the fight if any one of them died, the other two should give to the son of the deceased, one third share more in addition to his share of the umbali-land. When one of them died in the fight, his son was given the land as per the agreement. An epigraph from Sarpavaram of S.1334 records that certain Jangamas occupied the land belonging to the temple of Bhāvanārāyana. The dispute was referred to a council, which after due enquiry directed the Jangamas to vacate the land. The members of the council, who settled the dispute, received as remuneration each 1 putti of rēgada land and pandumu of garuvu land from the fields of the temple. A record from Tirupati of the time of Kapilēśvara states that the Mahājanas of Tirupati were unjustly enjoying the temple lands. Raghudēvēndra, the governor at Rājahmundry ordered the treasury officer and the chief priest to enquire into the matter, who afer due enquiry restored the lands to the temple.

5. There were examples of the official intervention in settling boundary disputes of villagers. An epigraph from Duggirāla of S.1136 refers to the boundary dispute between the villages of Duggirālapuṇḍi on the one side and Ivani, Duggamapuṇḍi and Mōramapuṇḍi on the other. The disputants sought the intervention of Mallaparāju and Rudraparāju, the two peggaḍas, who were sent by the king Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva for settling the dispute. They advised the disputants to refer the issue to the arbitration of the Mahājanas, who selected a certain Sūraparāju, son of Ivani Boḍarāju to walk the boundary. The boundary walked by Sūraparāju was accepted. The record states that those who violated the new boundary would be guilty of killing 1000 tawny cows on the banks of the Gaṅges.

An inscription from Srīkūrmam of S.1152 mentions the boundary dispute relating to the villages, Ponnaḍiya and Bontalakōṭi, which was settled by an examination of the records. The dispute arose when the inhabitants of the village of Bontalakōṭi claimed their right over certain garden lands situated on the boundary belonging to the village of Ponnaḍiya. The disputants had sought the intervention of Aniyaṁka Bhīma III, who appointed as judicial tribunal to settle the dispute. The Nāyakas of seven villages (named) and the Mahājanas of Tāḍitoṟiti were selected as judges and one Narasimha Mahāmuni conducted the proceedings of enquiry. After examining the records (śāsanas) of Ponnaḍiya, the boundary was fixed in favour of Ponnaḍiya village as per the judgement of the tribunal, called Pūmtāku. It was decided that the offenders of the agreement should be punished by confiscating their property, or expelling them from the society, or declaring ostracism, or depriving them of their livelihood. The judgement was

signed by all the judges of the tribunal and the king approved it. This shows the keen interest taken by the rulers of the period in settling the disputes of the people. It indicates the democratic principle adopted to allow the disputes to be settled by the people themselves. It also shows the method of settlement of village disputes. Precautions taken against the violation of agreement show that whenever disputes were decided by elders, their decisions were accepted without fail by the parties concerned.

A record from Oṅgōle of S.1194 refers to the boundary dispute between the villages of Oṅgōle and Murikinūtalapāḍu which was settled by a single witness. Three persons Dammukadēvanāyuḍu, Gaṅgarāju and Bairapanāyaka who were sent by Mādhavadēva Mahārāja, with the help of the Reḍḍis of the eight families of Arulūru and Pellūru sthalas, selected a certain Boṭṭuvīḍu Prōli Reḍḍi to walk the boundary. The person who walked the boundary received two hundred kuṇṭas of land as remuneration for his services. This shows the practice of selecting an individual by the counsil of arbitrators to walk the boundary in presence of the disputants, arbitrators and elders of the places concerned. The boundary walked by the person was accepted by the disputants, and the elders present were its witnesses.

An undated epigraph from Pālem mentions the boundary dispute between the villages of Vasantapuram and Vellamgōḍu, which was settled through negotiations among the Mahājanas of the villages concerned. The record states that the Mahājanas of Vellamgōḍu excavated a canal as a feeder to their tank, Pōtireḍḍi-ceṟuvu, which encroached into the lands of the Mahājanas of Vasantapuram. They

also excavated a tank called Pina-Pōti-Reddi-Ceruvu which not only inundated some land but also distroyed the old boundary belonging to the village of Vasantapuram. After negotiations, the Mahājanas of the two villages agreed to restore the former boundary and to pay a sum of 12 mādas as well as 10 mādas worth of land from the fields of the Mahājanas of Vellamgōdu as compensation for the loss incurred by the Mahājanas of Vasantapuram.

6. Trial by ordeal was another method adopted to settle village disputes. It included different forms of ordeals like ordeal of water, fire, poison, balance, etc. An inscription from Babbellapādu of S.1470 (a record of the later period cited for elucidation) mentions the boundary dispute between two villages, Gudimetta and Babillapādu. The record$ states that one Mēda Timinēndu performed the ordeal of walking the boundary carrying a fire-pot. An epigraph from Chilamkūru of S.1140 refers to the grant of some land to a certain Mēdarametta Srīgirināyudu who walked the boundary of the village.

SECTION: 7

CONCLUSION

The following observations emerge from our study of village assembly based on epigraphic evidence.

1. There were four kinds of villages during the period. They were: Rāca-Ullu (royal villages), Nāyamkara-Ullu (Nāyamkara villages) Brahmadēyas (Brāhmin agrahāras) and Dēvadāyas (temple villages.) The distinction of this classification was only fiscal in nature. The Brahmadēya and Dēvadāya villages were exempted from the payment of certain taxes, whereas other villages were not. While the Nayamkara

holders were responsible for the collection of taxes of the villages under their control, the royal villages were under the control of the concerned village assembly, which collected and remitted taxes to the treasury.

2. The village assembly was variously known as Samasta-Praja, Aṣṭādaśa-praja, Intivāru, Okkalu, Mahājanas or Gāuṇḍas. While in the case of Brahmadēya villages the membership in the assembly was confined to the share holders, the membership in other villages was open to all households. The agrahāra had a special kind of assembly with restricted membership, whereas in other villages the membership was unrestricted, but a few prominent elders of the different communities appeared to have dominated the activities of the assembly.

3. There were officials in every village called the āyagārs. The Reḍḍi and the Karṇam were the main officers who looked after the village administration. These āyagārs were the servants of the village rather than the servants of the government.

4. The village assembly carried on several functions like maintenance of public works, supervision of gifts, collection of taxes payable to the government and administration of justice.

5. While all the people in a village were members of the village assembly, cultivators in a village alone were members of the Chitramēḷi which forms the subject matter of our study in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE GUILD OF CULTIVATORS

SECTION: 1

INTRODUCTORY

The guild of cultivators receives its legal sanction from Gautama, the earliest authority on the Dharmaśāstra (2-2-21), who says that cultivators can make rules of conduct for themselves. Like traders, oil-makers and artisans, cultivators also formed themselves into a corporate body even from a very early period. They possessed their own praśasti and tradition.

TERMS FOR AGRICULTURISTS AND THEIR GUILDS

The term Kāṁpulu denotes tillers of the soil or protectors of the soil. The Kāṁpulu in the Telugu country were the same as the Veḷḷāḷas, who were agriculturists in the Tamil country. The guild of Veḷḷāḷas known as the Chitrameḷi, which was an organised corporation of cultivators in the Tamil country, also flourished in southern Āndhra extending from the river Krishna to the borders of the Tamil country. The guild of agriculturists called Kāṁpulu was found in all parts of Medieval Āndhra. We shall first deal with the Chitrāmēḷi and later with the Kāṁpulu.

SECTION: 2

THE CHITRAMEḶI

The mēḷi or mēḍi or mēṇi in all the South Indian languages viz Telugu, Kannaḍa and Tamil refers both to the vertical pillar of the plough as well as the plough itself. In Tamilnāḍu and southern Āndhra the guild of agriculturists was known as Chītramēḷi or the ornamental plough. The members of the Chitramēḷi guild were known

as Bhūmi-putras or Chitramēḷa. They were called as Bhūmi-putras because they depended mainly on land to earn their livelihood and as Chitramēḷa because they were worshippers of the god Mēḷīśvara (No. 665 of 1958-59) or Chitramēḍi Śrī Jasamēśvaradēva (No. 18 of 1953-54). A village granted to the god by the Chitramēḷi guild was called Mēḍikūṟu in an undated inscription from Ellanūru in Anantapūr district. In fact, the names of villages, such as Mēḍicerla, Mēḍikoṇḍūru, Mēḍikurti, Mēḍikūṟu, Mēḍipāḍu, Mēḍipalli, Mēḍiseṭṭipālem, Mēḍūru and Mēḷaceṟuvu indicate the origin of the organisation of the Chitramēḷi in the Telugu country.

While an assembly of cultivators was known as Mēḷi-Sāsirvāru in a record from Gobbūru of the time of Vikramāditya VI in Karnāṭaka, it was called Chitramēḷi-Periyanāḍu in Tamilnāḍu and Āndhra. An agrahāra under its organisation was known as Chitramēḷinallūru (NDI, ii, N.72), whereas the temple under its patronage was called Chitramēḷivinnagar or Tiruppārkadar Chitramēḷivinnagar. The maṇḍapa of the temple where meetings of the assembly took place, was known as Chitramēḷimaṇḍapa. ~~Even~~ Edicts of cultivators were known as Chitramēḷi-śāsanam. Thus the guild, members, villages, the town, the agrahāra, the assembly, the temple, the maṇḍapa, the nāḍu and all those under its organisation were named after the guild, a practice which was unique in its nature. All these examples go to show the importance of the guild of cultivators or how it exerted its influence in several ways over the life of the people.

THE PRAŚASTI OF THE CHITRAMEḶI

Like other professional groups, the cultivators possessed their own praśasti. An inscription from Nellōre of S.1119 as well as other Chitramēḷi edicts (given under references) refer to the Praśasti of

cultivators. They called themselves as Chitramēliśa and sons of the illustrious Bhūdēvi. They also called their corporation as Chitramēliyōm. They were extolled in the Chitramēli-śāsanas as protectors of dharma and rāstra. They claim to possess good qualities.

An epigraph from Tirukoilūr (South Arcot district) gives the following details of the praśasti of the Chitramēli (SII, VII, No.129). Śrīmatuṁ-Bhūmi-putrāṇāṁ (Śrīmaṅtulaina-Bhūmi-putrulayokka or the sons of the illustrious Bhūdēvi, who possessed enough wealth) Srīmad-gōkshīra-jīvanaṁ (Sampadyuktamaina-Āvu-pālanē-jīvanamugākala-vāriyokka or whose prosperity in life was due to the milk of cows) Sarvalōkahitan-nyāyaṁ (Sarva-prajala-srēyassē-jīvita-dharmamugā-kōrunattivāraina or whose dharma was to look after the welfare of all the people) Chitramēlaśya-śāsanaṁ (Chitramēlulayokka-śāsanamu or this is the edict of Chitramēla) Jīyatāṁ-jagatāṁ-ētat-pālanaṁ-rāstrapōsanaṁ (Jagattulanu-jayiṅcagala-vīri-īvidhānamu-rāstra-saṁrakshaṇakoraku-vuddēsiṁpa-badinatuvaṁti or whose profession, the best in the world, was intended to help the people of the country) Śāsanaṁ-Bhūmi-putrāṇāṁ-cāturvarṇa-kulōdbhavaṁ (Cāturvarṇya-kulōdbhavulaina-Bhūmi-putrulayokka-śāsanamu or this is the edict of the sons of Bhūdēvi who were born in the four castes).

The praśasti states that the cultivators possessed enough gō-sampada, a source of prosperity in life. They worshipped the goddess Bhūdēvi, the very sustenance of life for them. It may be mentioned here that while the other professional groups worshipped the god Śiva in different forms, the cultivators appeared to have worshipped both Śiva and Vishnu (see under gifts to temples). Both the Chitramēla and the Kampulu worshipped Vishnu the lord of waters,

Bhūmi and Lakshmi. The Chitramēli inscription from Nellōre of S.1119 mentions that the cultivators gave a gift to the Vishnu temple of Chitramēlivinnagara. An epigraph from Śrīkūrmam of S.1167 states that the Kampulu gave the gift to the god Śrīkūrmanāthadēva and His consorts, Lakshmi and Bhūdēvi.

SECTION: 3

ORGANISATION OF THE KAMPULU

Having described the organisation of cultivators known as Chitramēli which flourished in southern Āndhra due to Chōla influence, we come to the organisation of cultivators known as Kampulu which was to be found throughout Āndhra.

The guild of Kampulu was organised at different centres. The village was a centre of their organisation. All agriculturists living in a village were included in the organisation, as is evident in the examples given below.

S.No.	Place	Date	Cultivators
1.	Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1050	Kampulu of Navapalli protected the gift.
2.	Mukhalingam	S.1054	Kampulu of Tūlagāma protected the gift
3.	Mahendragiri	S.1055	Kampulu protected the gift
4.	Mukhalingam	S.1056	Kampulu of Yinṭūru gave the gift
5.	Dvārapureḍḍipālem	S.1071	Kampulu of Tālaṇḍa agreed to protect the gift.
6.	Mukhalingam	S.1072	Kampulu of Maliparīti protected the gift.
7.	Pālakōl	S.1091	Kampulu of Meṭṭaparīti gave the gift.

8.	Srīkūrmam	S.1167	Kāṁpulu of Yīndapuram gave the gift.
9.	Muṅganūru	S.1185	Kāṁpulu protected the gift.
10.	Yenamadala	S.1185	Cultivators of Yenamadala gave the gift.
11.	Mēlacēṟuvu	S.1233	Cultivators gave the gift.
12.	Mēḍikoṇḍūru	S.1240	Kāṁpulu and other communities made the gift.
13.	Jonnalagaḍḍa	S.1241	Kāṁpulu of Pōtavaram made the gift.
14.	Kopparam	S.1245	Kāṁpulu along with other cultivators made the gift.
16.	Mukhaliṅgam	37th year of Gaṅga Anaṅtavarma	Kāṁpulu protected the gift.

Next to the village, there was a sthala or nāḍu organisation. A record from Kopparam of S.1245 mentions that the Kāṁpulu, other cultivators and the inhabitants of Kopparam sthala agreed to give to the temple of Varada Gōpīnātha and Rāma-Lakshmana a portion of their incomes for the merit of the officers of Kopparam-sthaḷa and Pratāparudradēva (. . . Rudralemkaṁgārunnu-Kopparaṁ-sthalamu-ēlucuṁnuṁdaṁgānu-ā-prajalu). In this case, it is evident that the cultivators had a sthala level organisation. The agriculturists who included the Kāṁpulu and other tillers in every village of Kopparam sthala were probably the members of the organisation. Kopparam was its headquarters.

A record from Dvārapureḍḍipālem of S.1071 states that the Kāṁpulu of Tālanḍa-twelve agreed to receive the gift of land towards the maintenance of a lamp in the temple. Tālaṇḍa-twelve, a territorial

division was also known as Tālandanādu. An inscription from Attirāla of S.1194 also refers to the organisation of cultivators in Pottapi-nādu. As already mentioned, the nādu like sthala was a group of villages. Thus the cultivators of all villages under the jurisdiction of a nādu formed themselves into an association for purpose of the the corporate functions.

There was a mandala organisation. The Nellōre record of S.1119 refers to the organisation of cultivators of Jayangaonda-Chōla-mandalam. While the nādu was a district, the mandala was a province. The Jayangonda-Chōla-mandalam included under its jurisdiction eight nādus. The cultivators of these nādus, such as Pēdainādu, Pērāttinādu, Mungalārattainādu, Kadaiyasinganādu, Pūngainādu, Tongaipūnulnādu, Chakalanādu and Pottapinādu assembled together to make a gift to the temple of Chitramēlivinnagar. The list of signatures at the end of the record, who consented to the grant, may be said to have been the representatives of the above nādus,which were the constituent units of the mandala organisation of cultivators. It is evident that the cultivators in the province of Jayangonda-Chōla-mandalam organised the guild in each of its villages and nādus. It was a provincial organisation. Nellōre was its headquarters. The head of the mandala organisation was probably the Mandala-Nāyaka (SII, V, No.1188) or Mandali-Kampu (NDI, II, Kandukūr, 41). An epigraph from Bhōgapuram of S.1100 mentions the rājya level organisation of the guild also. It states that a certain Nādisetti, the head of the dēśi merchants (Dēśiyābharana) made a gift of some land pertaining to the agricultural community of Bhōgapuram with the consent of the rājya, rāstra and grāma Dēsirattadlu (the agricultural community in the village) of the guild of cultivators for their prosperity. Thus the village, the sthala, the nādu, the

mandala or the rājya level organisation of cultivators suggest that the cultivators possessed an effective country-wide association capable of uniting all cultivators for the benefit of mutual co-operation in improving the scale of production and distribution of the produce to the best advantage of all cultivators. But information is meagre for a detailed account of the association at its various levels. It is also not known how the units were formed, their relationship with the centre or the machinery of the organisation, either local or central.

MEMBERS OF THE GUILD

The guild of cultivators was not a caste guild. Its members were those who lived by ploughing the land. They included men of different castes and men in pursuit of various professions. This character of the guild finds its sanction in Vijñānēśvara who in his Mitākṣāra defines a Śreṇi as a guild of persons earning their livelihood by the same kind of labour, though belonging to different castes or the same caste (IHC, 1951, p.123). It may be said that the Kāmpulu in the beginning were members of the guild. Later, the guild included not only agriculturists but also men of different professions. That is, all those who had owned the lands and followed the profession of cultivation came to be called Kāmpulu. The following are a few examples. The record from Kopparam of S.1245 mentions that the Kāmpulu and other tillers of the place agreed to pay the contribution of one cinnamu per year per head to the temple (Kopparapu-Kāmpulunnu-takke(na)-dunnēprajalunnu). The Kāmpulu were stated in the record separately as a community, showing a distinction between the Kāmpulu and other tillers of the place. This distinction was social in nature

only since the rate of contribution was the same for all agriculturists. This specific mention of the Kampulu and other tillers of the place was made only to show that the cultivators of Kopparam included men of different castes. It might mean that the Kampulu who had been cultivators for a very long time came to distinguish themselves among other cultivators by choice as a separate agricultural community. Perhaps, they might have evolved by that time into an endogamous sub-sect of the fourth caste. In one example, reference was made to all cultivators without showing any distinction of caste. A record from Yenamadala of S.1185 states that all Kampulu of Yenamadala (Yenamadala-Kampulamdaru), who included among them Brahmins, Gollavāru and others, made a gift to the god. The guild of cultivators collected the contribution from men of different castes because they were the members of the guild; otherwise it could not impose a tax on them. In another example, the guild of cultivators included men of the same caste whose hereditary occupation was not cultivation. An inscription from Śrīkūrmam of S.1167 records that the Kampulu of Yīdapuram were Gollalu, whose head was Prōlakōnāri (Golla-Prōlakōnāri-lōpaina-Kampulu). In this case, the Gollavāru were known as Kampulu and the term Kampulu in this context denoted cultivators. A Pēruru record of A.D.1119 also refers to an annual contribution made by the Golla-Kampulu (Andula-Golla-Kampulu-entam). It may be said that the men of Golla community owned the lands to raise their cattle, sheep and other live-stock and thereby they became members of the guild of cultivators. Two records from Mukhalingam (undated, 2 and 3) refer to the Teliki-Kampulu. The Telikis were originally oil-pressers. When they followed the occupation of cultivation, they came to be

regarded as Teliki-Kāmpulu. Thus the guild of cultivators included all those who followed the occupation of cultivation without ~~the~~ distinction of ~~the~~ caste to which they belonged as its members.

The guild included members of different professions. A Katukūru record of S.1225 states that Brāhmins, Kāmpulu and Nambis, who cultivated the land made the contribution to the temple. A record from Nāgulapāḍu of S.1225 registers that all people of the 18 communities, such as Kāmpulu, Gollavāru, Kōmaṭis, Idaras, Akkasālas, Weavers and others made to the god the contribution both on the ploughed land and houses. A record from Mēlaceṟuvu of S.1233 mentions that all the people including Velamas of the place made to the temple the gift of contribution fixed at the rate of one cinnamu for a puṭṭi for all bags of grain sown on all wet land and dry land. These records thus show that not only agriculturists, but also men of different castes and professions were members of the guild of cultivators.

LEADERS OF THE KAMPULU

The cultivators of each village had their own leader known as Kāmpu or Kāpu or Nāyaka. The record from Dvārapureḍḍipālem of S.1071 refers to twelve Kāmpulu who were the leaders of cultivators living in twelve villages comprising the Tālaṇḍanāḍu (yiṇdula-panḍreṇṭi-Kāmpulunaipeṭṭiri). In this case, the leaders of the twelve villages were acting together on behalf of the cultivators of the division, Tālaṇḍanāḍu. According a record from Mukhaliṅgam of S.1056, the leader of cultivators was Nāyaka. In an another record from the same place of S.1006 a leader was called Kṛiṣīvalārya (the cultivator

gentleman). Sometimes, the cultivators undertook the corporate responsibilities under the leadership of certain persons. The Telugu words used to denote the leadership of these persons were Pampuna (on behest of), lōpaina (under the authority of), Ūrimottamuna (on behalf of the village) and berasina (under the direction of). Inscriptions from Mukhalingam provide us with these examples. A record of S.1056 (No.1016) mentions that under the authority of Brahmmi Nāyaka, the Kāmpulu of Yintūru gave the gift of a lamp to the god (Yintūri-Brahmmi Nāyaku-lōpaina-Kāmpulu-icciri-ācamdrārkamu-nadupamgalavāru). Another record of S.1072 (No.1018) states that at the behest of Koru Sūre, the Kāmpulu of Malipariti agreed to maintain a lamp in the temple (ē-dīpamu-korusūre-pampuna-malipariti-Kāmpulu-āchandrārkamu-nadapamgalavāru). An inscription (No.1029) records that on behalf of the village, the Kāmpulu of Peddakondla (village) headed by Bhatti-Nāyaka, Kāpi-nāyaka and others accepted to maintain a lamp in the temple (Peddakondla-Bhattināyaka-Kāpināyaka-berasina-Kāmpulu-ūrimottamuna-ē-diviyaku-nācamdrārkamu-nadapamgalavāru). Another inscription (No.1051) mentions that the Teliki-Kāmpulu of Bamdinigāma headed by Peddipōtināyaka, Yerayamanāyaka and others received the deposit to supply ghee for the maintenance of a lamp in the temple. It is evident that the cultivators of each village elected or selected one or two leaders who acted as the leaders of the guild.

VENUE OF THEIR MEETINGS

The venue was the mukhamandapa of the temple in a village. Inscriptions refer to the collective gifts made by cultivators, who

assembled together in the precinct of the temple for the said purpose. The Chitramēli inscription from Nellōre of S.1119 records that the cultivators of the Chitramēli guild met together in the mukhamandapa of the Vishnu temple at Nellōre. The record from Attirāla of S.1194 mentions that the cultivators of Pottapinādu assembled in the Chitramēlimandapa to enter into an agreement.

SECTION: 4

FUNCTIONS OF THE GUILD:

Taxes

The guild of cultivators exempted land from the payment of tax. The Nellōre record of S.1119 mentions that the Chitramēli guild made the gift of some land to the temple free of tax. It meant that the land was under the control of the village. The guild exercised the right of fixing and collecting taxes on land from the cultivators payable to the government likely under the provision of the tax-farming system. The record from Ellanūru states that the Chitramēli guild made to the temple the gift of the village Mēdikūru and plots of land in other places. The inference here was that the guild granted the income derived from taxes to be collected from the village of Mēdikūru to the temple. It collected taxes on land under the control of the village; otherwise it could not grant tax-free land gifts. It may be said that the guild enjoyed certain rights of ownership on the land which belonged to its members. Dr. Lallanji Gopal (Economic, p.1) writes that " for all practical purposes the peasant was the owner of land". He also says (Economic, p.4) that "Medhātithi subscribed to individual ownership of land".

The guild imposed a tax on its members for religious purposes. The record from Kaṭukūru of S.1225 ~~registers~~ says that Kāmpulu and others who cultivated the land made to the temple the contribution at the rate of one cinna per māḍa per maruturu per crop on all ploughed and wet lands yielding two crops a year. The record from Jonnalagaḍḍa of S.1241 mentions that the cultivators of Pōtavaram made to the temple the contribution at the rate of one vīsa per māḍa on all sales. The inscription from Kopparam of S.1245 states that the cultivators made a gift of one vīsa per head per year to the god. The Ellanūru record mentions that the members of the guild made certain tolls and taxes to the temple.

Temple affairs

The guild looked after the affairs of temples under its patronage. The Ellanūru undated record states that the members of the Chitramēḷi guild appointed one Vyāpakadēva, a pupil of Yajña Jiyyar of Pushpagiri, as the srīkāryam of the temple. An epigraph from Mēḍikurti of S.1143 refers to the consecration of god Chitramēḍi Sri Jasamēśvaradēva at Vellanūru.

Land gifts to temples

The guild made land gifts to temples. The Nellōre record of S.1119 registers that the Chitramēḷi guild made the gift of 2,200 kuḷi of land to the temple. The record also indicates that the guild possessed probably ~~the~~ common land under its control for corporate purposes. A record from Nawābupēta of S.1216 mentions that the cultivators purchased some land and granted it to the temple. An inscription from Mēḷaceṟuvu of S.1233 records that all the people of the place made the gift of land consisting of

13 marturus of wet land to the temple

Endowments to temples

The guild made gifts of land or gold or sheep, as the case may be, to the temples. It also looked after the gifts entrusted to its care. Some of the temples under the care of cultivators are given below.

S.No.	Place	Date	Name of the temple
1.	Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1024	Nīlīśvaradēva
2.	Mahēndragiri	S.1055	Gōkarnēśvaradēva
3.	Mukhaliṅgam	S.1056	Śrīmadhukīśvaradēva
4.	Dvārapureḍḍipālem	S.1071	Chōḍa Gangīśvaradēva
5.	Pālakōl	S.1091	Kṣhīrārāmaliṅgēśvaradēva
6.	Nellōre	S.1119	Chitramēḷivinnagar
7.	Meḍikurti	S.1143	Chitramēḍi Śri Jasamēśvaradēva
8.	Śrīkūrmam	S.1167	Śrīkūrmanāthadēva
9.	Muṅganūru	S.1185	Gaurēśvaradēva
10.	Yenamadala	S.1185	Rudrēśvara-Srīmahādēva
11.	Attirāla	S.1194	Paraśuramēśvaramudaiya-Nāyanār
12.	Jonnalagaḍḍa	S.1214	Gōpīnāthadēva
13.	Kaṭukūru	S.1225	Gōpīnāthadēva
14.	Mēḷaceṟuvu	S.1233	Svayaṁbhudēva
15.	Chimaṭa	S.1234	Bhīmanāthadēva
16.	Mēḍikonḍūru	S.1240	Prasanna Gōpīnātha
17.	Kopparam	S.1245	Gōpīnāthadēva and Rāma-Lakshmana
18.	Ellanūru	Undated	Chitramēḷi-Deśamīśvara mudaiyār

TRUSTEESHIP:

(i) Land gifts

The guild of cultivators acted as the trustee of the public property. It received land donated by others towards the maintenance of service in the temple. It managed the temple property for common purposes. The record from Mukhaliṅgam of S.1056 states that a certain Ponnayaseṭṭi entrusted his gift of one puṭṭi and Paṅḍumu of land to the cultivators of Yiṅṭūru towards the maintenance of a perpetual lamp in the temple. Another record (undated 3) registers that one Nūṁkana entrusted his gift of three puṭṭis of land to the Teliki-Kāṁpulu of Baṅdiṅigāma towards the maintenance of a perpetual lamp in the temple. The record from Dvārapureḍḍipālem of S.1071 mentions that one Yerepōtu entrusted his gift of one and half puṭṭis of land to the cultivators of Tālanḍa-twelve towards the maintenance of a perpetual lamp in the temple. The maintenance of land gifts implied the corporate responsibility of cultivating the land and utilising the income received therefrom for the said purpose on behalf of the donors by the members of the guild.

(ii) Cash gifts

The guild received deposits of cash for the purpose of maintaining lamps in the temple. Records from Nārāyaṇapuram of S.1050 and S.1059, Rellivalasa of S.1053, Mahēndragiri of S.1055, Pālakōl of S.1091 and Mukhaliṅgam (Nos. 1018,1029 and 1081) mention cash gifts entrusted to the guild of cultivators. The maintenance of cash gifts implied the duty of conducting the banking operations of receiving deposits, lendaing the amount to others on interest and utilising the income derived from the interest for the said purpose.

The guild functioned like a mutual aid society.

(iii) Gifts of sheep

The guild accepted the gifts of sheep to provide ghee regularly for lighting perpetual lamps in the temple. The record from Śrīkūrmam of S.1167 mentions that the cultivators of Yīndapuram made the gift of 25 sheep towards the service in the temple. The guild itself undertook the care of the sheep as well as the maintenance of the gift. Another record from Muṅgamūru of S.1185 states that the cultivators of the place received 50 ewes towards the maintenance of two perpetual lamps in the temple. It is evident that the guild of cultivators not only acquired, managed and disposed of the common land, but also acquired and maintained sheep, cattle or other live-stock for the common benefits of all agriculturists in a village. Thus the guild served both as benefactor and trustee of the property of religious institutions.

Discipline

The guild of cultivators maintained good discipline. Any person who destroyed a grant or disobeyed an agreement was to be considered a traitor to the guild, the god and the society. It also imposed social restrictions on the offenders. According to the record from Nārāyaṇapuram of S.1050, the cultivators, who failed to maintain the gifts entrusted to them, were to be considered to have committed the sin of stabbing a thousand tawny cows near Gaṅgas. The record from Pālakōl of S.1091 declares the offender to have committed the sin of killing Brāhmins, cows and drinking from the skull of his eldest son. The Nellōre record of S.1119 also declares the offender of an agreement to have incurred the sin of stabbing a tawny cow on the banks of the

river Gāṅgas. The record from Jonnalagaḍḍa of S.1241 considers any hindrance to the agreement was equal to the commitment of five great sins.

Agriculture

The guild being an influential local body created facilities for the improvement of agriculture. The cultivators and the kings appear to have carried on the torch of progress in agriculture. The kings took interest because agriculture was the main source of revenue to the government, whereas agriculture was the primary means of livelihood to the cultivators. The development of agriculture necessitated the improvement of irrigation methods and reclamation of land. A number of tanks, canals and wells were constructed by kings, officials and others to improve irrigation facilities and to bring new land under cultivation. Some of them were Gaṇapa-samudramu, Kēsari-samudramu, Pillalamarri-samudramu, Sabbi-samudramu, Prōla-samudramu, Pākāla-lake, Ramappa-lake, Nandigāma-cheruvu, Yanamadala-cheruvu, Chiṁtala-cheruvu Uppalapāṭi-cheruvu, Miriyāla-chēruvu, Rāvipāṭi-kāluva, Vaṁśavardhana-kāluva and Gaṇḍapeṅdāru-kāluva. Samudramu or lake denoted a big tank capable of supplying water to irrigate a vast area of land for cultivation. Cheruvu denoted a small tank. Kāluva denoted a canal dug for the purpose of getting water from the tank or river to irrigate the fields. Bēta II is stated to have constructed Kēśari-samudram and installed Varuṇa, the presiding deity of waters. In fact, the Kākatīya kings in particular and other kings in general made arrangements to cut down the dense forests and bring new land under cultivation. A record from Anumakoṇḍa of S.1084 and another from Tripurāntakam of S.1174 refer to the clearance of forests for the purpose of cultivation. It may be said that these irrigation facilities helped the cultivators

to improve agriculture by bringing more land under cultivation and increasing the scale of production and distribution.

SECTION: 5

<u>CULTIVATORS AND OTHER VILLAGE COMMUNITIES</u>

The cultivators not only lived together as an organised community in each village but also co-operated with other professional groups ~~who followed cultivation on matters~~ in regard to matters of common importance. The Kaṭukūru inscription of S.1225 records that the <u>Mahājanas</u>, the <u>Nakaramu</u>, the <u>Kāmpulu</u>, the <u>Balañjisettis</u> and others made together a contribution to the temple. The record from Nāgulapāḍu of S.1225 refers to a tax paid to the temple by the cultivators, the Kōmatis, the Īdaras (toddy sellers), the Gollavāru, the Akkasālas, the Sālevāru and others. A record from Kokkirēni of S.1236 mentions that the Sālevāru, the <u>Kōmatis</u>, the <u>Kāmpulu</u>, the Gollalu, the Brāhmins and officials of the place made together a tax to the temple. These records show that the cultivators lived in association with other communities and bore their share of expenditure in every activity of the village corporation.

SECTION: 6

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

We may now conclude our study of the guild of cultivators as it flourished during the medieval period with the following observations based on ~~clinching~~ inscriptional evidence:

(1) The cultivators of land in a village formed themselves into a corporate body, called the <u>Kāmpulu</u>.

(2) All those who lived by ploughing the land were regarded as Kampulu (cultivators) irrespective of their caste. While the Kampulu were hereditary cultivators, members of other castes came to be called Kampulu by choice of their occupation. The Golla-Kampulu played an active role in the activities of the guild in the Telugu country, in the same way as the Iḍayār community associated with the Chitramēḷi guild, which was originally a corporation of the Veḷḷāḷas in the Tamil country. The leaders like Prōlakōnāri acted as the spokesmen of the guild of cultivators.

(3) The village, the sthala, the nāḍu, the manḍala or the rājya level organisation of cultivators suggest a country-wide association of the cultivators for agricultural purposes.

(4) The cultivators acted in each village under the leadership of one or two persons who were their executive heads. The leader was elected or selected most probably by consensus. Membership and leadership of the guild were open to all cultivators without any difference. The leader was called Kampu or Nāyaka.

(5) The assembly of the cultivators met in the temple precincts. Its decisions were binding on all members. The offenders of the agreements were punished. The assembly acted as the custodian of the interests of cultivators.

(6) The guild acquired, managed and utilised the corporate property in a village for common benefits of all cultivators.

(7) The guild discharged several functions. It accepted deposits in cash, maintained the land in trust and took care of common property or common fund. It conducted the activities of the cultivators of the village.

(8) The guild created facilities for the development of agriculture. It improved the methods of irrigation and brought more land under cultivation. It exercised control over the production and distribution of the produce.

(9) The guild of cultivators co-operated with other communities on matter of common importance in a village and assumed corporate responsibilities in that capacity.

CHAPTER-IV

THE NĀDU

SECTION: 1

INTRODUCTORY

The nāḍu was a popular local body in medieval Āndhra. The earliest reference to it appears to be in the Koneki inscription of A.D. 669. It was a group of villages. The assembly of the villages of a nāḍu was called by the same name. Thus the word nāḍu denoted both a territorial unit and a territorial assembly. The basis for its formation was the common interests of the villages. The nāḍu assembly met frequently to attend to the needs of all the villages under its jurisdiction. It had the responsibility of the administration of the region and discharged corporate responsibilities connected with taxation, irrigation, public works and justice.

The system of dividing territory into units called nāḍu or vishayas for purposes of administration was a popular practice not only in Āndhra but also in contemporary Karnāṭaka, Tamilnāḍu and Kērala. The nāḍu was known as a unit of self-government even from the early medieval period. The nāḍu became a popular assembly during the period of the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṅgi and continued to be so under the Kākatīya, the Reḍḍi and the Vijayanagara kings. Dr.T.V.Mahalingam (1940, pp.215-216) observes that "the nāḍu enjoyed similar powers as the village assembly but the jurisdiction extended over a wider area. The nāḍu and the sabhā were quasi-independent republics in the local areas managing local affairs, bearing the responsibility for the carrying on of certain branches of administration in the local areas".

SECTION: 2

LOCATION OF NĀḌUS

The following are some of the nāḍus with their present location. This list is intended to show their prevalence all over the Telugu country during the period. Information about the administration of some of the nāḍus under the different ruling dynasties and references to some of the nāḍus in literature are available. This information is given along with the ~~information about~~ location.

S.No.	Name of the Nāḍu		Approximate location
1.	Aṁgaḍamaṅtanāḍu	...	Corresponds to Ātmakūr tālūka in Nellōre district.
2.	Anumakoṇḍa-vishayamu	...	Present Anumakoṇḍa region in Warangal district. Anumakoṇḍa was its chief village. It was a small principality and became popular under the Kākatīyas. It was a territory of 7000 villages.
3.	Attili-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Tanuku tālūka and a part of Bhīmavaram tālūka in West Gōdāvari district. Attili was its chief village. It was a sub-division of Pāmāra-Vishayamu.
4.	Aizamunnūrunāḍu	...	Corresponds to Alaṁpūr and Gadwāl tālūkas in Mahbūbnagar district and a part of Kurnool tālūka in Kurnool distric Aiza was its chief village in the Gadwāl taluk. It was also known as Aiza-sthala. It is the original home of

the present Munnūru-Kāpu community(?), which is a flourishing community in this region, particularly in the districts of Telaṅgāṇa. It was a territory of 300 villages, as can be seen from its name.

5. Āharupākanāḍu	...	Corresponds to Peddāpuram tālūka in East Gōdāvari district.
6. Cheḍupilināḍu	...	Corresponds to Rāpūr tālūka in Nellōre district.
7. Eraḍa-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Vizayanagaram and Chīpurupalli tālūkas in Visākhapaṭnam district.
8. Eṛuvanāḍu	...	Corresponds to Podili, Darsi and Mārkāpūr tālūkas in Ongōle district and Badvēlu, Rājampēṭa and Siddhavaṭam tālūkas in Cuddapah district. Its chief village was Turimeḷḷa.
9. Gudrahāra-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to the tālūkas of Guḍivāḍa, Kaikalūru, Masula and a little tract on the southern side of the river Krishna.
10. Haruhanāḍu or Parigi-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Hindūpūr tālūka in Anantapūr district. Its chief village was Parigi.
11. Jantarunāḍu	...	Corresponds to Sriṅgavarapukōṭa tālūka in Visākhapaṭṇam district. It was a district of 70 villages and towns.

12. Kadalunādu	...	Corresponds to Kākināda tālūka and a part of Rāmachandrapuram tālūka in East Gōdāvari district.
13. Kallakelagunādu	...	Corresponds to Makhtala tālūka in Mahbūbnagar district. Ujjali was its chief village.
14. Kamderuvādi-vishayamu	..	Corresponds to Guntūr tālūka and eastern part of Sattenapalli and northern part of Tenāli tālūkas in Guntūr district.
15. Kammanādu	...	Kammanādu was one of the ancient nādus of the Telugu country. It was known as Kammākaratha during the period of the Ikshvākūs. It continued to be a unit of administration under the rule of the Eastern Chālukya, Chōla, Kākatīya, Reddi and Vijayanagara kings. It was called Kammanādu in the Maliyapūndi grant of Ammarāja II. An inscription from Tangedumalli of S.1037 mentions Kammanādu. Another inscription from Idupulapādu of S.1131 refers to Karmarāstra. A Kannada poet, Ponna (C. A.D.950) stated that he belonged to Punganūr, a village in Kammanādu. The first Telugu poet, who made a reference to Kammanādu, was Pāvulūri Mallana (C. A.D. 1100). It corresponds to

Bāpaṭla and Narasaraopēṭa tālūkas in Guṇṭūr district, Oṅgōle, Darsi and Mārkāpūr tālūkas in Oṅgōle (Prakāsam) district. It is the original home of the present Kamma community. It is also known as Kamma-vishayamu.

16. Kaṇḍūrunāḍu ... Corresponds to Nalgoṇḍa tālūka in Nalgoṇḍa district and Mahbūbnagar tālūka in Mahbūbnagar district. Its chief village was Kōḷūr (Kōḍūr). It was a territory of thousand villages.

17. Kaṇiyakallunāḍu ... Corresponds to Rāyadurgamu tālūka in Anantapūr district. Goddavāḍi was its chief village. It was also known as Kaṇiyakallumūnūru-nāḍu.

18. Kannemūnūrunāḍu ... Corresponds to Nandikoṭkūru tālūka in Kurnool district.

19. Koṇḍapallināḍu ... Corresponds to the tract of Koṇḍapalli near Bezawāḍa in Krishna district.

20. Koṇḍapaḍamaṭidēśa ... Corresponds to the eastern portion of the Sattenapalli tālūka in Guṇṭūr district. Nādenḍla was its chief village. It was a territory of 73 villages.

21. Karnāḍu or Kamnaḍa or Kannaḍa-4000 ... Corresponds to a part of the Nandyāla and Nandikoṭkūr tālūkas in Kurnool district. It is possible that the Kamnaḍigas may have originally settled in this region. It was a district of 4000 villages.

22. Kāsalanāḍu	...	Corresponds to the region comprising the northern part of Warangal, Hyderābād, parts of Medak and Karīmnagar districts. It is the original home of a sect of the Brāhmin community, called the Kāsalanāṭi-Brāhmins. There is also a branch of the Kōmaṭis known as Kāsalavāru.
23. Makhtala-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Makhtala tālūka in Mahbūbnagar district. Makhtala was its chief village. It was also known as Makhtala-sthala and Magatala-bhūmi.
24. Mañchikoṇḍanāḍu	...	Corresponds to the region between Anumakoṇḍa and Koravi in Warangal district.
25. Mingalanāḍu	...	Corresponds to Gūḍūr tālūka in Nellōre district.
26. Mulikināḍu	...	Corresponds to Kamalāpuram, Cuddapah, Proddatūr and Pulivendla tālūkas in Cuddapah district. It was a territory of 300 villages and later became a division of 4000 villages. It was also known as Mulikināṭi-bhūmi and Muliki-vishayamu. It was the home of the Brahmins known as the Mulikināḍu Brāhmins.
27. Muṇḍanāḍu	...	Corresponds to Kōvūr tālūka in Nellōre district. It was the centre of the Muṇḍa

community. It was called so after the name of this community.

28. Natavāḍi ... Corresponds to Nandigāma tālūka in Krishna district.

29. Padanāḍu or Pidanāḍu ... Corresponds to Nellōre, Gūḍūr and Sūllūrupēṭa tālūkas in Nellōre district.

30. Palnāḍu or Pallināḍu ... Palnāḍu was an ancient territorial division. It was an unit of administration under the Sātavāhanās. It rose to prominence under the Haihayās and one of them was Chāgi Bētarāja. Its capital town was Mācherla. It was a territory of 300 villages. The earliest epigraphic evidence to Palnāḍu is made in the Koneki grant of Vishnuvardhana II, dated A.D. 669. An inscription from Mācherla of S.1033 mentions Pallidēśa, that is, the territorial division of Palnāḍu. Another inscription from Durgi of S.1191 refers to Pallināḍu, that is, Palnāḍu. Srīnātha's Palnāṭivīra Caritra, a popular Telugu ballad of this period, gives a detailed account of the contemporary political, social, economic and religious conditions in Palnāḍu. It corresponds to Palnāḍu tālūka in Gunṭūr district. It was probably the early home of the Pallavas. It was a centre of Buddhism.

31. Pānāra-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Tanuku, Bhīmavaram and Narasāpuram tālūkas in West Gōdāvari district.
32. Pākanāḍu	...	Pākanāḍu, an important territorial division of the Telugu country, is mentioned in many inscriptions of the Nellōre district. An inscription from Uppuguṇḍūru of S.1140 mentions Pākanāḍu. Another inscription from Chāpalapalli of S.1152 states that Pākanāḍu was a sub-division of Jayangoṇḍa-Chōḷa-Maṇḍalam. Nannichōda in his Kumāra-sambhavam and Mancana in his Keyūrabāhu-caritra made references to Pākanāḍu. It was successively under the rule of the Chālukya, Chōḷa, Kākatīya, Reḍḍi and Vijayanagara kings. It corresponds to the present Nellōre district, extending from the Kandukūr tālūka on the north to Venkaṭagiri tālūka on the south and from the sea on the east to Udayagiri tālūka on the west. It is the original home of the present Pākanāṭi-gollalu. It was a territory of 21000 villages. It was also known as Pākanāṭi-vishayamu.
33. Pottapināḍu	...	Pottapināḍu derived its name from its chief village, Pottapi, which was its

headquarters. It became the seat of Konidena Chōdas under Daśavarma. An epigraph from Attirāla of S.1194 mentions that Pottapinādu was a sub-division of Adhirājēndra-mandalam. Another inscription from Nellōre of A.D. 1198 records that Pottapinādu was a sub-division of Jayangonda-Chōda-mandalam. It corresponds to Rājampēta tāluka and parts of Siddhavatam and Proddatūr tālukas in Cuddapah district. It was surrounded by four nādus on all sides, namely, Pākanādu in the east, Mulikinādu in the north, Vengōnādu in the west and Rēnādu in the south. It was also known as Pottapi-bhūmi.

34. Pōritinādu ... Corresponds to Kāvali tāluka and northern part of Pākanādu.

35. Prakkinādu ... Corresponds to Anakāpalli tāluka and a part of Elamanchili tāluka in Visākhapatnam district.

36. Prōlunādu ... Corresponds to Pithāpuram, Tuni, a part of Peddāpuram and a part of Kākināda tālukas in East Gōdāvari district.

37. Pulinādu ... Corresponds to the tract of Punganūr in Chittoor district. It was ruled by the Nolamba Pallavas. It extended under the Nolamba Pallavas upto Gangavādi and Kōlār district.

38. Pūṅginādu ... Corresponds to the region on both sides of the river Guṇḍlakamma in Oṅgōle and Guṇṭūr districts. Addaṅki was its chief village. It was also known as Pūṅgināṭi-vishayamu.

39. Rēnāḍu ... Rēnāḍu was fairly a big division and a territory of 7000 villages. The earliest epigraphic evidence to it is made in a record from Rāmapuram of the 8th century A.D. It was under the control of a branch of the Chōḷas during the period of the Chālukyas of Badāmi and the Greater Pallavas. It was successively under the Telugu Chōḍa, Vaidumba, Bāna and Vijayanagara kings. It may be noted that the Chinese Buddhist traveller Hiuen Tsang visited this region about A.D. 640-41. He stated that Buddhism was on the decline and Rēnāḍu was inhabited by the Hindus and the Jainas. It is mentioned in many inscriptions (SII, X, Nos. 594, 94 and 98). It corresponds to the region comprising Kamalāpuram, Proddatūr, Jammalamaḍugu and Pulivendla tālūkas in Cuddapah district, Hindūpūr and Kadiri tālūkas in Anantapūr district, Madanapalli tāluka in Chittoor district and Kōyilakuṇṭa tālūka in Kurnool district.

40. Roḍḍanāḍu ... Corresponds to Hiṅdūpūr and Penukoṇḍa tālūkas in Anaṅtapūr district. Its chief village was Roḍḍa. It was a territory of 300 villages.

41. Sabbināḍu ... Sabbināḍu was in the region of Telaṅgāṇa. It was a territory of thousand villages, and also 'Sapādalaksha'. Its chief village was Rāmagiri. Another famous village was Vēmulavāḍa. A record in the K.B. Museum of A.D. 1067 refers to Sabbi-1000. An inscription from Karīmnagar of S.1092 mentions Sabbināḍu. Another inscription from Śrīsailam of S.1235 refers to Sabbināḍu. Maḍiki Siṅgana, a Telugu poet, made a reference to Sabbināḍu in his work, Padmapurāṇōthara-khaṅḍam. Sabbināḍu corresponds to the tract west of the river Gōdāvari comprising the Karīmnagar district and its adjacent area ~~with~~ near Anumakoṇḍa in Waraṅgal district.

42. Sagara-vishayamu ... Corresponds to Kollēru region, comprising Eluru, a part of Bhīmavaram tāluka and a part of Taṇuku tāluka in West Gōdāvari district.

43. Sakilināḍu ... Corresponds to Badvēlu tāluka in Cuddapah district. It was also known as Sakili-bhūmi.

44. Sakatamantinanāḍu	...	Corresponds to Kākināḍa tālūka in East Gōdāvari district.
45. Samba-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Bobbili tālūka of Visākhapaṭnam district.
46. Sārakināḍu	...	Corresponds to a part of Vizayanagaram tālūka in Visākhapaṭnam district.
47. Sindavāḍināḍu	...	Corresponds to Ālūru and Ādōni tālūkas in Kurnool district. It was a territory of thousand villages.
48. Sīrenāḍu	...	Corresponds to the region of Kalyāndurg and Maḍakasira tālūkas in Anantapūr district. A community of Brāhmins calls itself as Sīrenāḍu Brāhmins.
49. Tālāḍināḍu or Tālaṇḍanāḍu	...	Corresponds to a part of Vizayanagaram tālūka in Visākhapaṭnam district. It was a sub-division of Eraḍa-vishayamu.
50. Tūrupunāḍu	...	Corresponds to Kāvali tālūka of the East Coast between Ongōle and Nellōre.
51. Vamgūrunāḍu or Vangūruvāḍi-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to Alampūr tālūka in Mahbūbnagar district.
52. Varāhavartani-vishayamu	...	Corresponds to the tālūkas of Srīkākulam, Tekkali and Parlākimiḍi in Srīkākulam district.
53. Velanāḍu	...	Velanāḍu, an important administrative division of the Telugu country, corresponds to the tract to the south of the river Krishna. The earliest epigraphic reference made to Velanāḍu is in S.763

(HGAP, p.306). An inscription from Valivēru of S.983 mentions that Velanāḍu was a territory of six thousand villages. Another inscription from Drākshārāma of S.1064 refers to Velanāḍu, a territory of 6,300 villages. It became prominent under the Velanāṭi chiefs. Chandavōlu or Dhanadapuramu was its capital. Velanāḍu was also known as Velanāḍudēśa or maṇḍala or "shaṭsahasra-vishayamu". It comprised the norther portion of Kammanāḍu under the Eastern Chālukyas. It became a powerful "maṇḍalika" division under Kulōttunga I. It was known as Velināḍu during the Kākatīya period. It is the original home of a sect of the Brāhmin community popularly known as Āruvēlanāṭi-Niyōgi-Brāhmaṇulu.

54. Vēlpūra-vishayamu ... Corresponds to a part of Vizayanagaramu tālūka and a part of Chīpurapalli tālūka in Visākhapaṭnam district. It was a sub-division of Eraḍa-vishayamu. Its chief village was Vēlpūra.

55. Vengōnāḍu ... Corresponds to Venkaṭagiri and Sūllūrupēṭa tālūkas in Nellōre district and the adjacent region upto Tirupati in Chittoor district.

56. Vēnāḍu ... Corresponds to Vāyalpāḍu and Madanapalli *tālūkas* in Chittoor district. It was a territory of thousand villages.

57. Vēṅgināḍu ... Vēṅgināḍu derived its name from its chief village, Vēṅgi in the West Gōdāvari district. It was one of the biggest divisions in the Telugu country. It was variously known as Vēṅgi, Vēṅgināḍu, Vēṅgi-*vishaya* and Vēṅgi-*maṇḍalamu*. The Allahābād pillar inscription of Samudragupta makes the earliest epigraphic reference to Vēṅgi. It was the capital of Hastivarman, the Śālaṅkāyana king. Later it passed into the hands of the Vishnukuṇḍin kings. It rose to prominence under Kubja Vishnuvardhana, founder of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty, and became famous as Vēṅgidēśa. Under Ammarāja, Rājahmahēndravaram became its capital. It corresponds to the region between the rivers Krishna and Gōdāvari. It was originally a territory of 1000 villages. Later it became a division of 16,000 villages.

58. Vijayavāṭi-vishayamu ... Corresponds to Bezawāḍa tālūka in Krishna district. Its chief village was Bezawāḍa or Vijayāwāḍa.

It may be said that these administrative divisions were not uniform in extent of area and they under went many changes. There were both small and big divisions ranging from 12 villages to 21,000 villages under their jurisdiction. Tālaṇḍanāḍu contained 12 villages, the smallest division, whereas Pākanāḍu comprised 21,000 villages, the biggest of the list. While some of them correspond to a modern taluka, others are equal to a district. The nāḍu, vishaya, bhūmi and sthala are identical and are referred to the same division.

SECTION: 3

NĀḌU AS A GROUP OF VILLAGES

As already mentioned, villages were grouped for the purpose of administration into several divisions, known as the nāḍus. An inscription from Dvārapureḍḍipālem of S.1077 records a gift of land for a lamp to the temple of Chōḍagaṅgīśvara at Dharmavaram, which was included in the Tālaṇḍa twelve, a sub-division of Eraḍupampu. That is, in the territorial division of Eraḍupampu, Tālaṇḍa was a sub-division and it contained twelve villages and one of them was Dharmavaram. In another inscription from Rellivalasa of S.1053, Tālaṇḍa is described as Tālaṇḍanāḍu. A record from Nadagam of A.D. 1058 states that twelve villages, comprising an extensive tract of land, were separated from the district (vishaya) of Eraḍa and they constituted a separate division, which was named the Vēlpūra-vishaya after its chief village,

Vēlpūra. Another record from Eradukēra of S.1051 registers that Eradukēra was a village in Suliyanūru seventy, which was a division of Sīr-nādu. This meant that Sīr-nādu had a sub-division of Suliyanūr seventy and that it contained seventy villages and one of them was Eradukera. In an inscription from Pithāpuram of S.1108, it is recorded that the village of Navakhandavāda, situated in Prōlunādu, was granted to the temple. This shows that Prōlunādu contained several villages under its jurisdiction and one of them was Navakhanda-vāda. Another inscription from Chēbrōlu of S.1049 mentions that Velanādu was a territory of six thousand villages. A record from Yenamalakuduru of S.1159 and another undated one from Drākshārāma state that the division of Vēṅgi comprised thousand villages. A copper-plate inscription from Elūru of A.D.1076 records that the king made a gift of twelve villages free of tax to his subordinate chief Mummadi Bhīma out of the thousand villages comprising Vēṅgi-vishaya as manniya-nibadham-ādipatyam (commissionership). This indicates that the territory of Vēṅgi, known as Vēṅgi-vishaya (district) or Vēṅginādu, contained one thousand villages out of which twelve were gifted away by the king to his subordinate chief. Mañcana, a Telugu poet of the 14th century, states that Pākanādu was a territory comprising 21,000 grāmas (villages). Another such division, known as the Kañdūrnādu is recorded in two inscriptions, one from Gaṅgāpuram of A.D. 1134 and another from Vardhamānapuram of A.D. 1224. The same division is called Kañdūr-vishaya in a record from Panugallu. In another inscription from Alavānipalli of A.D.1110 the same division is described as Kañdūr-thousand. It may be said that the territorial division, known as the Kañdūrnādu had one thousand villages under its jurisdiction. It was

also known as Kandūr-vishaya. An inscription from Tsandavōlu of S.1093 mentions that Kondapadamati-dēśa (country west of the hill) was a territory of seventy three villages. These epigraphic examples show that the nāḍu was a territorial division and contained a number of villages under its jurisdiction. It was also known as vishaya.

SECTION: 4

The assembly of the nāḍu was known as the nāḍu in the same way as the assembly of the nagara (town) was known as the nagara and that of the ūru as ūru. The Nāḍu was an assembly of all the people of that area.

AN ASSEMBLY OF THE PEOPLE

When the representatives of villages in a nāḍu met together, they formed the assembly of the nāḍu. There were meetings which were attended by all the residents of the nāḍu through their representatives. The inscription from Attirāla of S.1194 refers to an agreement made by the residents of Pottapināḍu in order to raise one māḍa from each of the villages in Pottapināḍu. The record does not mention either the total number of villages in Pottapināḍu or the total number of māḍas to be collected from each of the villages in the nāḍu. It may be inferred from the meeting that the agreement was made by the heads of all the villages in the nāḍu, because the contribution was to be collected from every village of the nāḍu. An inscription from Nandalūr of S.1355 confirms this view. It states that the principal residents of the five villages (named) in Pottapināḍu gave a gift to the temple of Chokkanādha-perumāḷ. The principal residents may mean the representatives including the heads of the five villages (named) in Pottapināḍu but not all the

residents of the five villages. Thus the assembly of the nādu was constituted by the representatives including the heads of each of the villages in the nādu.

SECTION: 5

VENUE OF THE NĀḌU ASSEMBLY

The chief village of the nāḍu was usually the centre of all activities of the nāḍu assembly. The venue of the nāḍu assembly was invariably the mukhamaṇḍapa of the local temple in the chief village. When gifts were made to temples, the inference was that the residents of the nāḍu assembled together in the mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple to make the gift to the deity. The following examples support this view. A record from Nellōre of A.D.1197 mentions that the inhabitants of nāḍus (named) met at Chitramēlimaṇḍapa to make a gift of land to the god at Chitramēlivinnagar. The epigraph from Attirāla of S.1194 records that the residents of Pottapināḍu met in the Chitramēlimaṇḍapa to enter into an agreement.

MEETINGS OF THE NĀḌU ASSEMBLY

The nāḍu assembly met in different ways. A benefactor could summon the nāḍu assembly. An epigraph from Naḍigallu of S.1167 refers to the assembly of Mer-pākkaināḍu which was summoned by Tikkaya Māraya. The head of the assembly was known as Periyanāṭṭu Vishayattār. On this occasion the members were the elders of the nāḍu. The purpose of the meeting was that ~~the~~ the village of Neḍuṅgaṛ-sevvaṇkuḷi was granted to the god Yōgi-Mallidēva by the above said benefactor in the presence of the nāḍu assembly. It meant that the village was under the control of the nāḍu assembly. Thus the consent of the nāḍu assembly was obtained while making the gifts to the god.

The nāḍu assembly could be summoned by an officer of the government. An inscription from Mallam, dated in the 15th year of the reign of Nandipōttarasar, makes a reference to the meeting of the nāḍu assembly. It was summoned by the officer Chalukkirasar on the petition of Āluvarasar. The members of the meeting were the men of the nāḍu, the villagers and the heads of assemblies. The purpose of the meeting was to make the gift of 35 kalanju of gold to the god Subrahmanya at Tiruvanbūr.

The nāḍu assembly could meet of its own accord. This was the usual type of meeting. The following are a few examples. The Attirāla record of S.1194, already referred to, states that the residents of Pottapināḍu met for the purpose of taking the decision to construct an embankment on one side of the river Cheyyēru. An inscription from Tangatūr of S.1237 mentions that the inhabitants of Pottapināḍu met together to grant taxes (specified) to the temple of Siddhāntadēva at Tangatūr.

The nāḍu assembly held discussions and took decisions at the end of its meetings. The Attirāla inscription of S.1194, as stated above, records the decision taken by the residents of the Pottapināḍu. A record from Alampūr of S.1221 refers to a certain nāḍa-nāluka Siriyāḷaseṭṭi. Here, Siriyāḷaseṭṭi was the tongue or spokesman of the nāḍu. It is evident that nāḍa-nāluka conducted the discussions in the meetings and helped the assembly to arrive at a decision. Nāḍa-nāluka was the same as Nāḍa-nālage mentioned in an inscription of A.D.1214 (Tiptūr tālūka) in medieval Karnāṭaka (Local, p.48). This speaks of the similarity in the functioning of some of the local institutions in both the regions of Āndhra and Karnāṭaka.

SECTION: 6

OFFICERS OF THE NADU

There were officers known as Gāundas or Prabhūs or Pergade* in charge of villages. These in charge of groups of villages were known as nād-gāundas or nād-Prabhus. An epigraph from Kambadūru of A.D. 884 mentions that a certain Kura-Gāmunda was the perggade. Perggade was an officer in charge of a village or of a nādu or of any department. A record from Sarajammanahalli of the time of the Hoysala king Vīra-Ballāla makes a reference to the gāvundas of the nādu (gavundas of Agali, Madhuvadi and Nidugalla-nādu). A record from Alampūr of A.D. 1067 refers to the Aiza-nādu prabhus, known as Kosanārya preggade Gōvindamarāja, Gundarya gāunda, Kāta gāunda, Guttaya gāunda, Polala gāunda, Nāmachiyam Valyana gāunda, satyananum Dāsa-gāunda, Mādhisetti, Polalisetti and Barmmisetti, who made a gift to the god Brahmēsvarasvāmi. It also states that Kosanārya Preggada was the saudhare of Ayje-300. An inscription in the K.B. Museum,Hyderābād dated A.D. 1096 records that a certain Sankarayya was the nādadhikāri (of Lombalika-70) (Nādādhikāri or Nādāluva may be the government officer in a nādu). It also refers to the prabhūs and gāvundas of Lombalika-70. Another type of an officer in charge of a nādu was vishayapati or Vishayattār. The inscription from Nadigallu of S.1167 makes a reference to a certain Periyanāttu vishayattar who was acting as a witness to the gift.

It may be inferred that the nādu possessed its own executive body to carry on its work. The head of the nādu, as seen above, was known as visayattar or vishayapati or nād-gāunda or nād-prabhu. Information is vague and scanty regarding the appointment, remuneration

---

* Pragada in Telugu

and functions of the head of the nādu. Inscriptions from contemporary Karnāṭaka provide us with the information that the head of the nādu was nād-gāuṇḍa or nādaprabhu. His office was hereditary, but occasionally he was elected. He looked after the work connected with taxation, agriculture, justice and municipal administration. He also attended to the all-round development of the nādu. His services were remunerated and he received contributions from the people of the nādu (Local, pp.37-43). It may be said that these functions and privileges of the nād-gāuṇḍa existed in the Telugu country also.

SECTION: 7

FUNCTIONS OF THE NĀḌU ASSEMBLY:

Nāḍu assembly functioning for a long period

The nāḍu assembly functioned continuously for a long period in the Telugu country. An example of this type was the nāḍu assembly of Pottapināḍu. Inscriptions from Nellōre of S.1119, Attirāla of S.1194, Nandalūr of S.1335 and Tangatūr of S.1237 and S.1652 record the meetings of the inhabitants of Pottapināḍu. These records show that the nāḍu assembly of Pottapināḍu functioned in its capacity as a self-governing local body from S.1119 to S.1652, that is, for more than five hundred years. This continuous existence of the nāḍu assembly may be taken to indicate a stable and effective functioning of the nāḍu on all common matters of local importance. It may be said that the nāḍu assembly, just like the nāḍu assembly of Pottapināḍu, functioned in the same way at other places where references were made to several nāḍus, mentioned above.

Public works

The nādu assembly looked after the work connected with the public works. The Alampūr epigraph of A.D.1067 mentions that the head of Ayje-nādu, several gāundas, settis and prabhus made a contribution of one gadyāna in every village of the nādu to the god Brahmēśvaradēva as well as to conduct repairs, white-washing, etc., of the temple. The Attirāla inscription of S.1194, as stated above, records the resolution of the meeting to collect one māda from each of the villages in the nādu. The purpose of the meeting was to protect the temple of Paraśurāmēsvaramudaiya-Nāyanār at Attirāla from the damage likely to be caused on account of the floods of the river Cheyyēru by constructing an embankment on the side of the river. It may be noted that the amount to be collected was sufficient to construct the embankment as well as to meet the expenditure for its maintenance. It meant that the assembly of the nādu exercised the right of collecting taxes from every village under its jurisdiction to undertake public works. It protected temples to promote cultural activities and looked after their maintenance. The record shows the spirit of co-operation among the residents of the several villages in matters of common interest. Thus the nādu assembly promoted self-reliance among the villages, provided civic amenities to the people and undertook the collective responsibility of carrying out public works for the welfare of the people.

Endowments to temples

From religious and patriotic motives, the residents of the nādu made joint endowments in the form of cash and taxes on goods

to temples. The Nandalūr record of S.1355, as mentioned above, states that the principal residents of the five villages in Pottapi-nāḍu, namely, Prōlināḍu, Lembāka, Tālapāka, Tangatūru and Opili made together a gift to the temple of Chokkanādhaperumāḷ situated on the bank of the river Cheyyēru. It was a collective gift made jointly by the residents of the five villages to the temple. But the record does not state from which source the gift was made, whether the money was received from the common fund or the money was collected from the five villages for the said purpose. In this case, the assembly was formed in relation to the needs of the people of the five villages in Pottapināḍu. Thus the nāḍu assembly looked after the needs of either all villages or of a few villages under its jurisdiction as per the requirements of the people.

Land gifts to temples

The assembly of the nāḍu made gifts of land to temples. An example of this type may be given. The Nellōre epigraph of A.D. 1197 mentions that the inhabitants of nāḍus (named) made land free of tax to the Vishnu temple at Nellōre.

Social regulation

The nāḍu assembly introduced social regulations for the benefit of the people. An undated record from Sattravāḍa records that the residents of Tirani-nāḍu in Nēdunāḍu and others gave to a certain Mēḷittēvan, the village of Tiraṇi as rudirappaṭṭi, who in turn presented it to the Dēsa-Vināyaka temple at Satterappāḍi and prohibited the sects of Sanketisamayakkārar and Vīra-Koḍiyar from entering it. This meant that the gift-village was under the control

of the assembly of the Tiraṇi-nāḍu and others. The record shows that the assembly of the people of the Tiraṇi-nāḍu, others and Mēḷittēvan together introduced certain rules of conduct for the above sects. This also indicates the social status of the above-mentioned sects, which were prohibited to enter into the village and the temple. It shows that the nāḍu assembly possessed complete control over the villages under its jurisdiction. It was its responsibility to regulate the life of the people in accordance with the traditions of the people. Thus the nāḍu assembly safeguarded the interests of the people. It may be inferred that the nāḍu assembly punished those who disobeyed its regulations. Thus it discharged certain judicial functions also.

Collection of Taxes

The nāḍu assembly collected taxes from each of the villages under its control. The inscription from Attirāla of S.1194 refers to the collection of taxes by the assembly of the nāḍu. The Taṅgatūru inscription of S.1237 records that the inhabitants of Pottapināḍu agreed to pay to the temple of Sidhanāthadēva at Taṅgatūru voluntary contributions at the rate of 4 kāsu on each ~~on each~~ buffalo-load, 3 kāsu on each bullock-load, 2 kāsu on each bag of betel-leaf, other articles and grain. It may be said that the nāḍu assembly exercised certain powers of taxation. It also acted both as a representative body of the people and an agent of the government. As a representative body of the people, it enjoyed the right of fixing and collecting taxes from the region under its jurisdiction. It preserved self-government in the nāḍu. As an agent of the government, it collected taxes payable to the government by

the people. Thus the nādu was the connecting link between the government and the people. An inscription from Attirāla of S.1609 also shows this practice. It records that the Reḍḍis, Karṇams and Brāhmins of the Pottapināḍu fixed a grant of a pāṭika for each ghattivarāha of the revenue of the village (Attirāla) to the god Trātēśvaraswāmi. ~~(this record is cited for information)~~.

Common Fund

The nāḍu assembly appears to have maintained a common fund of its own. The fund was obtained from several sources. A source of the fund was the income derived from the common land. The Nellōre record of S.1119 refers to the gift of land to the extent of 2,200 kuli made by the assembly of the inhabitants of the nāḍus (named). This meant that the assembly of the nāḍus possessed common land which it could utilise for the common benefit of the people. But the record does not mention the income to be derived on the land every year. As the land was intended to meet the expenditure for the maintenance of services to the god, it may be inferred that the gift-land yielded income every year. Prior to granting the land to the god, the income received on the land must have gone to the common fund. An inscription from Siddhāvaṭam of S.1529 mentions that the people of the village of Siddhāvaṭam district made a gift of 100 bighas of land to a person (named). ~~(This record is cited as an example)~~. This record also supports the view that the nāḍu assembly possessed the common land and it was a source of income to the common fund. Other sources of income to the common fund included collection of contribution from each village forming a nāḍu and collection of local taxes, as stated above. The common fund raised

in this way was utilised by the nāḍu assembly for the common benefits of the people. An inscription from Taṅgatūru of S.1652 also confirms this practice ~~(a record of later period cited as an example)~~. It records that the inhabitants of Pottapināḍu and Pulugulanāḍu made an annual charitable contribution at the rate of 30 pagodas in Pottapināḍu and 10 pagodas in Pulugulanāḍu to a certain Saraswati Sōmayājulu.

Royal Orders

An inscription from Piṭhāpuram of S.1108, while recording the grant of the village of Navakhaṇḍavāḍa in the district of Prōlunāḍu to the temple, states that the grant was communicated to the inhabitants and the officials of the district (vishaya) of Prōlunāḍu. This meant that the nāḍu assembly communicated the royal orders of grants of gifts to the people for their information and observance.

Summary of the Functions

In brief, the following were the functions of the Nāḍu assembly. The nāḍu assembly was formed for the promotion of co-ordination, co-operation and mutual assistance. It met in the mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple and took decisions to provide the people with civic amenities. It collected contributions and local taxes from each of its villages. It raised ~~the~~ a common fund to conduct corporate activities. It exercised the right of fixing and collecting taxes payable to the government. It took great care of public works like the construction of an embankment on the side of the river to protect the temple from being damaged by floods. It improved the means of irrigation by constructing tanks and canals (Attirāla, S.1209). It provided avenues of habitation to the people by clearing off dense

forests and by founding new villages. It granted gifts to temples for their maintenance. It promoted cultural activities. It safeguarded the interests of the people. It exercised certain judicial powers. It helped to form the public opinion on local matters of collective responsibility. It was the connecting link between the government and the people.

SECTION: 8

STHALA ASSEMBLY

The sthala was an administrative unit in the Telugu country like the nāḍu in contemporary Tamilnāḍu and Karnāṭaka. It may be said that in some places nāḍu was known as sthala. It denoted both a territorial division and a place. Other terms used for groups of villages or sub-divisions included maṇḍala, sīma, bhūmi, dēśa, pāḍi, rājya, daṇḍapāṭa, chāvaḍi and kampana. The sthala is described below.

A group of villages formed the sthala. A few examples may be given. A Pedakonḍūru record of S.1239 mentions that the Konḍūr-sthala contained 18 villages under its jurisdiction. An inscription from Maṇūr of A.D.1315 refers to Maṇūr-sthala which contained 12 villages. An undated-2 record from Yenamadala registers that the Ynamadala-sthala consisted of 60 villages (Gurindala-sthala also comprised 60 villages). An epigraph from Malkāpuram of S.1499 records that the Rāvipuṇḍi-sthala was formed with 19 villages. Addaṅki, Aiza, Aralūru-peḷḷūru, Bikkavrōlu, Chadalavāḍa, Haruha, Kōna, Kaṅdukūru, Lēpākshi, Makhtala, Mahadēvicherla, Naṅdyāla, Piṅgali, Pulivāṅdla, Pennabaḍi, Tēkmal and Taṅgeḍa were some of the sthalas.

The sthala assembly was known as the sthala. The sthala assembly consisted of (1) Headmen of the villages forming the sthala and officers of the sthala (2) the inhabitants of the sthala (3) the merchant guilds.

The sthala assembly met usually in the chāvaḍi or hall. It had its own office. Its officer was known as the sthala-karṇam or or dēśāyi-karṇam (C.P. Nos. 13 & 14 of 1925-26). He looked after the work connected with the administration of the sthala. The sthala assembly attended to the needs of the sthala. The following are a few examples which show that the sthala functioned in the same way as the nāḍu did. An inscription from Tamgeḍa of S.1230 refers to an agreement made by the assembly of the 18 communities and Ubhaya-nānādēśi-pekkaṇḍru of the Taṅgeḍa-sthala. A Kopparam inscription of S.1245 mentions an agreement made by the people of the sthala to pay taxes (specified) to the god Srīvaradagōpinātha. A Sannigaṇḍla record of A.D.1318 states that Immaḍi Veṅkama-gāru, Rājavyavahāri of Kākatīya Pratāpa Rudradēva, along with the village officers, kolagāṇḍru and the head of the sthala, named Aunbalapati made a grant of 30 hotus of land free of all taxes to the temple to cover costs of amritḥapaḍi and saduapaḍi including the supply of salt. A record from Mācherla of S.1443 registers that Buyyana-pergaḍe Gōvindarāju-Mahāpātra, the Karṇam of Koṇḍapalli-sthala effected certain repairs to the temple of Chennakēśava of Mahadēvicherla. The Malkāpuram inscription of S.1499 records a mutual agreement on land measurement by the people of Rāvipūṇḍi-sthala.

SECTION: 9

NĀDU AND OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

The nādu assembly co-operated with the other local bodies in pursuit of common aims and objects. The Mallam record, as stated above, mentions that the representatives of the nādu (district), the villagers and other local assemblies joined together to make a gift of gold (specified) to the god Subrahmanya. The Sattravāda inscription, already referred to, states that the residents of Tiraninādu and others came together to make a gift (specified) to Mēlittēvan. The residents of ~~the~~ one nādu united with the residents of another nādu on common matters of collective responsibility. The Tangatūru record, already referred to, records that the assembly of Pottapinādu and Pulugulanādu made an annual charitable gift to a person (named). In this case, two nādus joined together for philanthropic purposes. The same spirit of co-operation made the nādus ~~to~~ join with the merchant-guilds and other local bodies in pursuit of common ends. The Sangamēsvaram inscription of A.D.1173, already referred to, mentions that the heads of the four-nādu and eight-nādu united with the heads of the settis (merchants) of Kannada-4000 (district) and Ededore-2000 (between the rivers Krishna and Tungabhadra) and others headed by the Five-hundred Swāmis of Ayyāvole, after constructing a portal (tōrana) and setting up an image of the goddess Bhagavati at Kūdalūru (the place of the gift), to make a gift of land to the temple of Sangamēsvara. The Kistnapatam record of S.1201, as mentioned above, states that the merchants of the nādus joined along with the merchants of towns, hills, the five mandalams and the foreign merchants (residing in the town) to enter into an agreement.

CHAPTER V

THE TOWN ASSEMBLY

SECTION: 1

FORMATION OF TOWNS

The terms used for towns were nagara, pura and paṭṭana. Many factors contributed to the formation and growth of towns. A village in which a fair was organised came to be developed into a town. A fair would draw sellers and buyers and become a place of business. Thus a centre of business developed into a town. A town grew around a temple. Usually a famous temple would attract people and become a place of religious worship. That is, a place of pilgrimage developed into a town. Sometimes, towns developed due to their vicinity to a river or sea. They were useful for transporting goods from the interior places to the ports. Amarāvati, Bezawāḍa, Ghaṇṭasāla, Kisṭnapaṭam, Masulīpaṭnam, Mōṭupalli, Nangegaḍḍa, Rājahmundry and Tangeḍa were a few examples of such towns. Sometimes, villages were converted into towns by kings and merchants for the promotion of trade. A record from Nelapalli of Noḷamba Pallavāditya mentions that the king converted the village of Kolaṭūru in Pulināḍu into a mercantile town (nagara) and gave it to a Baligāra merchant as kodage. The Basinikoṇḍa epigraph of A.D.1050 states that the assembly of merchants converted the village Sīrāvalli into a town (paṭṭaṇa). Towns were also founded by kings and ministers. Jagadāḷa Mummaḍi, the younger brother of Gaṇapatidēva, claimed to have constructed a town on the banks of a charming lake at the Maudgalya-tīrtha called Gaṇapapura in A.D. 1245. Anantarāsa the minister of the founders of the Vijayanagara empire was responsible for the growth of Anantapūr. Sometimes, a charter for

markets (santa-śāsana) helped the growth of towns. A record from Konidena of S.1357 mentions this example. Mōṭupalli was another example, the growth of which was due to the charters issued by the Kākatīya and the Reḍḍi kings. The kings and the merchants were responsible for the rise and growth of towns, whereas the merchants contributed to the development of trade and municipal administration in towns.

Very often, a town grew according to a plan. An idea of the town planning, arrangement and a number of quarters therein, division of the town into vādas or wards and place for the market at the centre can be had from the records of Penugoṇḍa (information is given in the chapter on Nakaramu), Visākhapatṇam, Nellōre, Anumakoṇḍa or Warangal. For example, Warangal (Ōrugallu) included the divisions like Nagarapu-vāḍa, Brāhmala-kumṭa, Ciramaṭṭi, Pānugantivāḍa, Uppasara-vāḍa and Maṭiya-vāḍa. Nellōre contained the divisions like the quarters of the merchants and the street of the artisans. A record from this place also mentions three streets in Nellōre (No. 541 of V.R.). An epigraph from Bōdan of A.D.1056 mentions the Indranārāyana street, the Brahmapuri street, the street of the artisans and the street of the dancing girls. Visākhapaṭnam possessed its own town assembly consisting of 12 members. This practice also prevailed in contemporary Karnāṭaka. For example, the town of Huli in Belgaum district was divided into ten parts called streets and each one was governed by an assembly of 100 members (Local, p.166). A few towns of Āndhra are described below.

ALAMPŪR

Alampūr is a famous place of pilgrimage situated on the banks of the tributary Tuṅgabhadra in the Mahbūbnagar district. Bāla Brahmēśvara is the presiding deity of the place. The temple has been

attracting pilgrims from near and far owing to its high religious sanctity. Alampūr is known as the Benāras of the South and the paschima-dvāra (western gate-way) of Śrīsailam, the abode of Lord Mallikārjuna. Its antiquity may be traced back to the Ikshvāku dynasty. From the archaeological remains, Md. Abdul Waheed Khan (AS,39, p.1) says that Alampūr existed from the beginning of the Christian era. But its glorious days began in the time of the Chālukyas of Badāmi. During this period most of the temple-building activity took place. It gained prominence during the period of the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa and became a capital town under their administration. It also attracted the merchants from near and far. Thus Alampūr is a good example of a pilgrimage centre developing into a prominent town (administrative aspect of the town is dealt with separately).

DRĀKSHĀRĀMA

It is in the East Gōdāvari district and one of the five ārāmas. It is a holy place of religious worship. The presiding deity of the place is god Bhīmēśvara. It was a business centre of the Nānādēśi-pekkaṃḍru. The Balañja-pekkaṃḍru carried on trade at this place as well as at other centres in the Rājahmahēndravaradaṇḍapāṭa comprising 21 sthalas.

GHAṆṬASĀLA

It is in Krishna district, situated on the east coast. It was an important port town during the ancient period. Its presiding deity was Jaladhīśvara (the lord of waters). The name of the god also shows that it was a centre of merchants engaged in overseas trade. It attracted the merchants from the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya countries. This town

is said to have promoted trade with Burma, Kāmbōḍiya, Jāva and Sumatra (HGAP, p.50). It served as an important centre of internal trading during the 11th and 12th centuries. It appears that this town of commercial importance lost its prominence when Mōṭupalli became an important entrepot of the coastal Āndhra.

HEMAVATI

Hēmavati (Anantapūr district) was an important mercantile town. It was also known as Hemjēru or Perumjēru. It was a market-centre of the ubhaya-nānādēśi of the four languages, Kannaḍa, Malayālam, Tamil and Telugu (No. 16 of 1917). An epigraph of S.1084 refers to the consecration of the temple of Dēśīśvara with the consent of all the Dēśi merchants. Another one of the 12th century A.D. mentions the gift of some land to the temple of god Mangēśvaradēva by one Sikkaludaiya-seṭṭiyar, who was vaḍḍavyavahāri and dēśimukhya.

KISTNAPATAM

It is a place of business in Nellōre district, situated on the east coast. It was also known as Kollaturai or Gaṇḍagōpālapaṭṭanam. It was a port town and centre of the Ubhaya-nānādēśi trading-corporation. The presiding deity of the place was god Manumasiddhēśvara. It is an example of a port developing into an important town.

MOTUPALLI

It is in Guṇṭūr district, situated on the sea-coast. It was a famous entrepot of overseas trade. It was a commercial town of considerable importance during the Kākatīya, the Reḍḍi and the Vijayanagara periods. It was not only a business place for diamonds and fine clothes but also a great market-centre of foreign (Dvīpāntara) traders. Its harbour offered facilities for the export and import

of various articles. The fact that Marco Polo (A.D. 1254-1324) visited this place shows the commercial importance of Mōṭupalli.

NELLORE

It was the chief town of the Nellore-nāḍu. It was a market-centre and attracted both native and itinerant merchants. It is an example of a fair leading to the development of a town(The administrative aspect of the town is given separately).

TAṄGEḌA

It ~~is~~ was a business centre in Guṇṭūr district, situated at the mouth of the river Krishna. It was the headquarters of the Taṅgeḍa-sthala. The presiding deity of the place is god Rāmanātha. It was a market-centre of the Chālumūla-ubhaya-nānādēśi-pekkaṇḍru, who were said to be the lords of Ayyāvoḷe.

TRIPURĀNTAKAM

Tripurāntakam is a centre of trade in Kurnool district, situated on the north-eastern side of the Nallamalai hills. It was an important centre of the Ubhaya-nānādēśi trading-corporation. It occupied an advantageous position between the regions of Āndhra and Karnāṭaka, and controlled the trade routes to the south and the Deccan. The presiding deity of the place is Tripurāntaka-Mahādēva. Inscriptions of this place of S.1192, S.1214, S.1218 and S.1309 show that Tripurāntakam was a flourishing business centre for more than one hundred years.

VISĀKHAPAṬNAM

It is an important town, situated on the east coast. It was also known as Kulōttuṅgachōḍapaṭṭaṇam. It attracted merchants who

carried on trade at different centres. The town assembly carried on the municipal administration. An inscription of S.1012 (No.651) refers to the merchants coming from the 18 Bhūmi-nagara (Ubhaya-nanādēśi) (merchants of the 18 Bhūmi means nanādēśi).

YENAMADALA

It is an important centre of trade in Guṇṭūr district of the coastal Andhra. A temple in this place is dedicated to the worship of god Gōpālasvāmi. It was an emporium of the Ubhaya-nānādēsi. It was also the headquarters of the Yanamadala-sthala-pekkaṁdru. Thus Yenamadala is an example of a profitable market-centre developing into a town.

SECTION: 2

SOME IMPORTANT URBAN CENTRES

Other important towns were Appāpuram, Bāpaṭla, Bāsar, Bhīmavaram, Bōdan, Chēbrōlu, Chennūru, Chiṭṭāpūr, Elūru, Gaṇapavaram (Sarpavaram), Gaṇapēśvaram, Gaṇḍikōṭa, Gōranṭla, Kāḷahasti, Kāḷēsvaram, Kaṅdūr, Karavaḍi, Kaṭukūru, Kōḍūr, Kolanupāka, Kommūru, Koṇḍavīḍu, Koṇḍapalli, Konidena, Koravi, Kōrukoṇḍa, Kūcimañci, Lēpākshi, Mācherla, Makhtal, Manthani, Maṇūr, Mārkāpuram, Meḍikurti, Mōpūr, Mukhaliṅgam, Nādeṇḍla, Naṅdalūru, Naṅdyāla, Nelapalli, Niḍadavōlu, Pākāla, Pālakōl, Pānugal, Paṭaṁchruvu, Peddakaḍumūr, Piṭhāpuram, Pushpagiri, Rāmēśvaram, Siddhavaṭam, Siṁhāchalam, Śrīkākulam, Śrīkūrmam, Śrīśailam, Taṅgatūr, Tēkmal, Tirupati, Tsandavōlu and Vīrūru.

SECTION: 3

NAGARA AS A COMMERCIAL CORPORATION

Some towns were the market-centres where particular commodities were sold. Such, for example, were Gaṅdha-nagaramu, Saṅta-nagaramu and Pañca-lōhāla-bēhāramu-ādēdi-nagaramu.

/ The nagaramu was known by the name of the town in which it was organised. Examples of such towns were Nellōre-nagaramu, Anumakoṇḍa-nagaramu and Penugoṇḍa-nagaramu.

/Sometimes, the nagaramu took its importance if its town was prominent among other towns. A record from Kāzīpēṭa of S.1012 makes a reference to the Anumakoṇḍa-purada-seṭṭi-pramukha-nagaramu. In this example, the prominence of the nagara was probably due to the avenues of trade available to the merchants in the capital town of Anumakoṇḍa. It might also be the central nagaramu in an association of nagarams. Aśēṣa-nagaramu or Samasta-nagaramu means all the members of the town assembly.

/ Merchants who traded in particular goods also called themselves nagaramu. For example, kūragāyala-nagaramu (traders in vegetables) and nūne-nagaram (traders in oil).

Sometimes, the nagaramu was known by the language of its members. Such, for example, were the Telugu-nakaramu and the Arava-nakaramu. While the former worshipped the god Telugu-nakarēśvaradēva the latter the god Arava-nakarēśvaradēva, as stated in the record of Pērūru.

/ The nagara organisation also spread over several towns. In this case, it appeared like a territorial organisation of wide area or a federation of town guilds. An epigraph from Tripurāntakam of S.1192 refers to an association of the nānādēsi-nagaramu (the Ubhaya-nānādēśi) of Pottapināḍu. It states that Srī-nagarēśvara-pāda-padmārādhakulaina-nānādēśi-nagaraṁ-saṅghānanu-Pottapināḍu-Tripurāntakampēṭa-ammina-sarakunaku-māḍaku-renḍēśi-kanari-vīsāla-lekkanu-magama-icciri(worshippers of the holy feet of the god Nagarēśvara,

who were coming from native and neighbouring places and the members of the association of Pottapinādu and Tripurāntakampēta, gave the contribution at the rate of two kanari vīsas per māda). It may be said that the ubhaya-nānādēśi residing in all towns of Pottapinādu formed themselves as a mercantile corporation commonly known as Nānādēśi-nagaraṁ and gave the above contribution to the god on the goods sold at Tripurāntakampēta as well as Pottapinādu. This organisation was similar to the Padinenmidi-bhūmi-nagara (the Ubhaya-nānādēśi (SII,X, No.651). The term Padinenmidi-bhūmi means the nānādēśi. Similarly, the Nakaramu of Penugonda was a federation of 18 towns in Vēngi-dēśa.

/These examples suggest that every town of commercial importance was the centre of the nagara organisation. The nagara organisation also included all towns in a Nādu, or Bhūmi, or Dēśa. Sometimes, the nagara included different mercantile corporations under its organisation. An inscription from Pērūru of A.D.1119 refers to eight corporations which were engaged in heringa trade at Pērūru. They were the Gangara-mūvattāru-bīdugalavaru (the corporation of 36 towns of the Gangas) Ghātaruhāru-hadientubīdugalavaru (the corporation of 18 towns of the Ghātaruhāru) Tulisandavaru (merchants), Lālavajjeyavaru (the merchants of Lāta), Balañjivaru (merchants of various castes who formed into a single corporation for the purpose of trade), Rumaduvaru (merchants) and Sankarapādiyavaru (the merchants of Sankarapādi).

SECTION: 4

THE TOWN ASSEMBLY

The term nagara was used to denote the town assembly. It was also known as Dēśi, meaning the native merchants. Other terms were nakara or nakharamu or nagaramu. K.A.N. Sastri (1937, p. 294) observes that "the nagaramu was in all probability a primary assembly

of merchants, which was organised as one of the local assemblies in important trade-centres and was the only assembly in places where the mercantile interests overshadowed all the rest". It may be said that the nagara preserved self-government in trade.

The town assembly carried on administration in the town and it was dominated by the merchants. Remission of taxes or granting of gifts or introduction of municipal regulations took place with its consent.

T.V.Mahalingam (1967, p.394) observes that there was a strong sense of oneness among the members of the nagara. Its members were known as nagaras, seṭṭis or paṭṭanaśvāmins.

THE HEAD OF THE TOWN

The nagara had its own head who presided over the meeting of the assembly. The chief of the nagara was known by various appellations in different places. An epigraph from Bhōgapuram of S.1100 mentions Dēśiyābharaṇa. An inscription from Hēmāvati of the 12th century A.D. makes a reference to Dēśimukhya. According to a record from Paṭamcheṟuvu of the Western Chālukya period, the head of the nagara was Nagara-mukhya. An epigraph from Alaṁpūr of S.1221 refers to Paṭṭanaśvāmi at Alaṁpūr.

HIS OFFICE

The chief of the town was sometimes the founder of the town or his descendants. His office was both acquired and hereditary, in the same way as it was in medieval Karnāṭaka. Sometimes, it was conferred by a king or representatives of the people. For example, the record from Nelapalli mentions that the Nolaṁba Pallava king appointed a

certain Nolambasetti as the head of Kolaturu nagara with the royal honours such as a horse to ride, an Umbrella, Alapantuvake, Kunche, Talige, Kilavatta, Addanige and Gaddige. Once appointed, the position became hereditary in that family.

HIS FUNCTIONS

The head of the nagara conducted fairs and supervised markets. He was the spokesman of the nagara. He collected tolls from the merchants, made gifts to temples and conducted the public works. He maintained good relations among the merchants. He was the connecting link between the government and the merchants. G.S.Dikshit aptly observes (1964, p.157) that, "He occupied a three-fold position. He enjoyed the confidence of the government, of the people and of the merchants."

HIS REMUNERATION

He received gifts of tolls from the shops of the merchants. An epigraph from Chilkūr of A.D. 1067 mentions that Pōlisetti, the chief of the nakara (guild) of the town, was granted angadi-siddhāya(specified) to be collected from the three types of shops, namely uttama, madhyama and kanishta varieties of shops. He was entitled to the privilege of receiving videmu. He also received rent-free land, which was his main source of income. It was known as kodage the same as the mānya land.

OTHER OFFICERS IN TOWNS

Besides the head of the nagara, there were probably other officers in towns. They were in charge of the nagara-kavile (town register). An inscription from Rājasāvaram of A.D. 1301 refers to

the nagara-kavile. Another inscription from Kolanupāk of A.D.1077 mentions that Sankaragandarasar ordered all the merchant-guilds at Kollipāka to pay taxes at the rate of one gadyāṇa for each shop per annum for the enjoyment of Perggade Kāvaṇayya and other Karṇams. It may be said that the Karṇams maintained the nagara-kavile and the chief Karṇam had the title of Perggaḍe.

VENUE OF THE TOWN ASSEMBLY

The venue of the nagara assembly was the mukhamaṇḍapa of the Nagarēśvara temple in the town. Usually it met of its own accord to discuss matters of common interest. One of the purposes of the meeting was to grant gifts of tolls to temples.

SECTION: 5

FUNCTIONS OF THE NAGARA ASSEMBLY:

TAXES

The nagara collected taxes from the people in the town. The record from Visākhapaṭnam of S.1012 (No. 651) mentions that the Nagaramu-12 collected probably taxes on houses or exempted houses from the payment of tax. A record from Maṭṭewāḍa of the time of Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva states that the general nakaramu and the special nakaramu of traders made a gift of various taxes to god Sōmanātha. Sometimes, the nagaramu fixed and collected the contributions from every house or shop of its members as recorded in the Warangal epigraph of A.D. 1228. Another one from Kush Mahal of the time of the King Kākatiya Gaṇapatidēva mentions certain contributions made to the god Sōmanātha-dēva by the nagara of merchants trading in five metals (pañchalōhālu), the nagara of the perfumers, bachu-māḍi nagara (money exchangers guild),

pomkakude-nagarams (guild of areca-nut dealers) and santa-nagara (guild of fair merchants) at Maṭhiyavāḍa.

The Nagaramu collected tolls on the goods sold in the town. The inscription from Pērūru of A.D. 1119 states that the people of Gaṅgara-mūvvāttāru (of 36 towns), Ghāṭarahāru (of 18 towns) and others made a gift to the temple of Svayaṁbhu Sōmēśvaradēva of Pērūru at the rate of two hāgas in every hundred Hīras of all the varieties of articles sold. Another record from the same place, already referred to, mentions that the Telugu-nakaramu and the Arava-nakaramu made the gift of dues to the same god collected on several articles of merchandise. A record from Godisala of A.D.1236 refers to the levy of aṁgaḍi-suṅkamu which was made for the worship and offerings of the god Bhīmēśvara. The Tripurāṅtakam record of S.1192 mentions that the nānādēśi-nagaramu granted the tax (specified) on goods sold in Tripurāṅtakaṁpēṭa to god Mahādēva. An epigraph from Waraṅgal (undated) registers the gift of certain taxes levied on merchandise by the nakara. Thus the nagaramu collected taxes on houses and shops in the town. It also collected tolls on goods sold in the market.

The nagara exercised control over the land under its jurisdiction. It made gifts of land to temples. A record from Mukhaliṅgam of S.1063 refers to the gift of land for a perpetual lamp to god Bhīmēśvara made by the Purahari of Nakarapuvāḍa. Another record from Mēḍikurti of S.1143 states that Mallaya Sāhini, the chief of merchants, granted three vrittis of land to the temple of Jaṅgamēśvara at Yellanōre. An inscription from Pākāla of A.D.1320 records that the Nagaramulōnivāru (merchants) of Nellōre granted land on which five tūms of seeds could be sown for a perpetual lamp to the

temple of Srīrāmayadēva. An undated inscription from Chilkūr refers to the gift of land and garden made to the temple of Nakarēśvara. These examples show that the Nagaramu either possessed its own common land in the town or purchased it for the said purpose from its owner. The taxes collected on houses, shops, goods and land formed the principal sources of income to the town assembly to undertake corporate activities.

MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

An idea of the local government may be had from the following examples. An inscription from Kāzīpet of S.1012 mentions a few details of the local administration, namely, collection of local taxes and administration of justice. Taxes included (1) three kinds of internal payments (2) customs (3) fines and (4) income from the natural resources. A record from Ālavānipalli of A.D.1110 records the following municipal regulations fixed to the town of Kōlūr (Kōdūr) by Yuvarāja Tailapadēva, the Nakaras, the heads of the Paṭṭa-sāligas and other local corporations. They included (1) New houses constructed were free from tax during the first year (2) Half of the usual tax in the second year (3) Full tax as on the old houses from the third year onwards (4) The tax on houses may be paid in three instalments (5) A person of one pura (town) should not enter and enjoy another, if so he would be fined (6) Profession tax to be paid by Sāligas (and other communities) (7) The property of such persons, who have no sons or daughters, their children or dāyādis (relatives eligible for property succession), becomes escheat to the king and it is made over for the repair and re-construction of

dilapidated temple. Thus the town authorities collected taxes and exercised control over the economic and social life of the people by enforcing regulations upon them.

PROTECTORS OF GIFTS

The nagaramu undertook the corporate responsibility of protecting the gifts made by its members. It was in charge of gifts made to charitable institutions. A record in the K.B.Museum,Hyderabad of A.D.1127 mentions that the gift of income of kolaga at Chintāmaṇipuram in Poṭṭalakeṛe was entrusted to the 40 okkalu of the town, the chiefs of the five maṭhās and Seṭṭikāra-samayas of the four villages. In this case, the local corporations were in charge of the gift. The epigraph from Pērūru, as mentioned above, states that the Telugu-nakara and the Arava-nakara should carry on one charity giving 2 rūkas in the best, and muyyaḍḍu in the middling and muppādika in the lowest, making a vīsamu (1/16) according to Samayamu-paṭṭa. It also mentions that the nakarams should carry on the charity of wet land given by Mallaya Nāyaka. Another record from Siṅgavaram of S.1127 registers the fact that the gift of 25 surabhi-mādas (coins) for a perpetual lamp to the goddess of Koṇḍapāṭidēvi by Puravari Mañchipreggaḍa was kept in charge of the nāyakas of Siṁhapura. It may be said that the maintenance of money gifts implied the duty of a banker in receiving the money, lending it for interest and the interest accrued thereon was to be utilised for the said purpose.

DONORS OF GIFTS

The nagaras gave gifts of collective contributions either in kind or in cash in the form of tolls on the goods sold in the markets

to temples. The Kāzipet record of S.1012 mentions that the Anumakoṇḍa-nagaramu made the gift of one māna (measure) of oil every day for a perpetual lamp to the god Umā-Bētēśvara. An inscription from Gaṅgāpuram of A.D.1116 refers to the gift of income derived from the tolls made to the god Sēlēśvara by the community of traders and the Seṭṭikāras. Another inscription from Kumāradēvam of S.1160 mentions that the nakara made the gift of taxes (on goods) to the temple of Ishṭakāmēśvara-Mahādēva of Gajjaram. These examples show that the nagaramu made gifts, took the responsibility of their maintenance and supervised the conduct of the gifts. Thus the nagaramu acted as both the donor and the trustee of the gifts made to provide the people with civic benefits.

BUILDERS OF TEMPLES

The Nagaras built temples to satisfy the religious zeal of the merchants. The inscription from Mēḍikurti of S.1143 says that Mallaya Sāhini, the chief of merchants, set up the image of Jaṅgamēśvara at Yellanōre. An inscription from Varadhamānapuram of A.D.1229 mentions that Dōmiseṭṭi and Vaidiseṭṭi (heads of merchants) of the town Kīrtinārāyaṇapura Tumbuḷa constructed the shrines of Sakalēśvara and other gods. The community of merchants (nagaram) also made the gift of income derived from cess or tolls on saleable articles. An undated record from Hemavati registers the fact that the Dēśi merchants of the Kubēra family and the Nakaras of the town (Hemavati) made the gift of tolls on goods (specified) for the maintenance and repairs of the temple of Dēśiśvara. Another record from Visākhapaṭnam of S.1172 refers to the gift of a maṇḍapa

made by a certain merchant to the temple of Karumāṇika-Āḻvār at Visākhapaṭnam.

DONORS OF TANKS AND WELLS

Many pious and public-spirited merchants donated tanks, built temples, dug wells and laid out public gardens. They also made gifts of land for their maintenance with a view to acquiring religious merit for themselves as well as for all their members of the community. This activity was viewed as a sacred one and as one of the seven acts of piety or the sapta-santanas. The following are a few examples. The record from Hemavati refers to the gift of tolls on goods sold in the market to meet the expenditure connected with repairs of the well. In this case, the people were provided with the amenity of the supply of water. The record from Vardhamānapuram of A.D.1229 refers to the construction of tanks by the merchants. These examples show that the nagaras undertook philanthropic activities.

BANKERS

The nagaras acted as bankers to the kings and some of them were known as king's merchants. A record from Drākshārāma of S.1060 mentions that Prōlisețți was the merchant of the Velanāți king Kulōttuṅga Cōḍa Goṅka. Another record from the same place of S.1061 records that Nūṁkkana was the merchant of king Kulōttuṅga Cōḍa Gāṅgeyarāya Goṅka (Goṅka II of Velanāḍu). The inscription from Bāpaṭla of S.1071, already referred to, states that Kannisețți was Kulōttuṅga-Cōḍa-Gaṅgēyarāya-samaya-sēnādhipati. This meant that Kannisețți was the commander of the army of the guild called

Kulōttuṅga-Cōḍa-Gaṅgēyarāya-samaya. In this case, the prefix of the royal name to the guild may indicate that the guild was named after the king, a practice which shows the prevalence of good relations between the government and the merchant guild. Kannisetti, the leader of merchants, in all probability, maintained good relations with the Velanāṭi king. In this way the nagaras contributed to the growth of the country's economy. A. Appadorai (1936, p.357) rightly observes that it was around the guild that the economic organisation of the medieval town centered.

SECTION: 6

THE NAGARA ASSEMBLY AND OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

The nagara co-operated with other local bodies on all matters of common interest. It played an important role in urban matters in co-operation with the other associations. A record in the Hyderabad Museum, dated S.1087, registers the fact that the nagara, the nānādēśi, the Banañjus and the one-thousand (nāḍu) made the gift (specified) to a temple and its servants. An epigraph from Gaṅgāpuram of the C.V.E. 28 mentions that the local merchant community and the Samasta-samayamulavāru together made a gift to the god. Another epigraph from the same place of the time of Chālukya Jagadēkamalla states that certain seṭṭis and Samasta-praja together made a gift to the god Sagarēśvara and god Sōmēśvara. The Waraṅgal inscription of A.D.1228 records that the native merchants (svadēśi), the foreign merchants (paradēśi), Ubhaya-nānādēsi (both kinds of native and foreign merchants), the saṅtanagaramu and other traders united to make the gift (specified) to the god Vīrabhadrēśvara. The record from Kistnapaṭam of S.1178 states that the men of the town and the

itinerant merchants (nānādēśi) joined together to make the gift (specified) to the god Manumasiddhēśvara. The Tripurāntakam record of S.1192 mentions that the nagaram and the nānādēsi joined together to make the gift (specified) to the god Tripurāntaka Mahādēva. The inscription from Kaṭukūru of S.1225 refers to the gift (specified) made to the temple of Srīgōpīnāthadēva by the Nagaramu, the Mahājanas, the Kāpūs, the Balañjiseṭṭi-Kāṇḍru and the other associations of the 18 samayas. These examples show that the nagaramu united with the other local associations to promote a corporate spirit among its members in attending to the common needs of the people.

SECTION: 7

LIFE IN SELECT TOWNS

Before describing the organisation and functions of guild assemblies in towns, ~~a sketch of~~ life in a few prominent towns will be ~~dealt with~~ sketched here.

PERŪRU

Pērūru (Nalgoṇḍa district) was an important town selected here for treatment for the variety of its constitution. It gained commercial importance in the period of the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa and the Kākatīyas. Its earliest record of A.D.1100 belongs to the reign of Vikramāditya VI (AS, 38, p.vii) and gives the following information. There were quarters in it belonging to the Brāhmins, Telugu merchants, Arava merchants, Golla-Kāmpulu, Telikis, local officials and others. There were several temples. The god Svayambhu Sōmanāthadēva was the presiding deity of the place. Kamalēśvara, Dhārēśvara and Mailēśvara were the attendant gods in

the temple of Svayambhu Sōmanāthadēva. There were two other Śaiva shrines both dedicated to god Nagarēśvara specially worshipped by the guild merchants. The god Vishnu and the goddess Vindhyavāsi had also their shrines.

In A.D. 1119 Mandalika Joyimayya granted Tālimatta, a hamlet of Pēruru as an agrahāra to god Svayambhu Sōmēśvara and the mahājanas in two equal shares. The share of the god was intended for daily service and the other part was divided into 34 shares which were distributed as Vrittis among Brāhmins (AS, 38, p.4). Again in the same year of A.D. 1119 of the time of Tribhuvanamalladēva, the merchants of the 36 bīdus of the Gangas, the 18 bīdus of Ghātaruhāru, Tulisandavaru, Lālavajjeyavaru, Balañjivaru, Rumaduvaru, Nalla-Rumaduvaru and Sankarappādiyavaru assembled together at Pēruru and made a gift of two hāgas on every hundred heringas on all the articles, in which they were trading, to the god Svayambhu Sōmanātha. The record also states that Vaddarāvula Dandanāyaka of hēru-sunka and all the heruva-praja (merchants) also assembled together to make a gift of one hana on each bīdu to the family of a certain Kuppanabhattopādhyāya (ibid, p.6).

An inscription of the time of Kandūr Bhīmana Chōda (Ibid,p.8) refers to the construction of dēva-griha to the god Svayambhunātha and gift of wet land made by Mallaya Nāyaka, an officer at Pēruru. The record also states that both the Telugu-nakaram and the Arava-nakaram should maintain the charity giving 2 rūkas in the best, and muyyaddu in the middling, and muppādika in the lowest, and that they should make it a visām according to samayamu-patta and carry on this charity. In addition to this, Telivāru (oil-mongers) gave a bottle of oil in every oil-mill, merchants who were engaged in trade of

different articles made contributions and all the shops gave 3 settigas of rice for the offerings to the three gods Arava-Nakarēśvara, Vishnu and Telugu-Nakarēśvara. Pērūru appears to have been a centre of several merchant communities coming from other places like Lata (Gujarat) and Tamilnāḍu for the purpose of trade. These merchants had their own guilds as well as their own shrines of the presiding deity of their guilds. These guilds not only looked after the business matters but also administered charitable endowments.

In an undated record, Malle Nāyaka is said to have established a nallillu (agrahāra) for Boyyabhaṭlu, and granted to him 2 gh. kh. of land in Pērūru (Ibid, p.10). In A.D. 1130, Ambēnāthadēva Daṇḍa Nāyaka, the Vaḍḍarāvuḷa-suṅkādhikāri of Kibbeṭṭe made a gift of taxes (specified) for daily service to the god Kēśavadēva installed by Yajñavalki Kēśavabhaṭṭa (Ibid, p.12). In A.D. 1136, Maṇḍalika Guṇḍaya, the Director of the Administrative and Military Affairs (kārya-khadga-sahāya-brityuṇḍu) of Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Kaṅdūri Oḍaya Chōḍa Mahārāja made a gift of 2 ghaḍa puṭṭis and 1 ghaḍa maruturu of land in the dēvabhāga of Taḍimaṭṭa for daily service in the temple of god Kēśavadēva (Ibid, p.11).

In A.D. 1144 (Ibid, p.13) while Gaṇapaya was exercising authority at Pērūru, a certain Chenneni Sōmi Nāyaṇḍu made some gift to the god Svayaṁbhū Sōmēśvaradēva of Pērūru. In A.D. 1145 Paḍuvaramu Mallaya Nāyaka made a gift of 3 ghaḍa-puṭṭis and maruturu in the land belonging to Mallayabhaṭṭu to the god Svayaṁbhū Sōmēśvara (Ibid,p.12). In A.D. 1260 Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Pratāpa-Chakravarthi Vijaya Permāḍidēva-rāja made a gift of lands to the temple of Svayaṁbhū Sōmanātha. The

grāma-svāmis of Pērūru were entrusted with the maintenance of the charity. The grāma-svāmis appear to be the households who were the heads of the assembly (Ibid, p.14). In another inscription (Ibid,p.19), it is stated that Gaṅgavelli and his brothers (named) made a gift of some village (name not known) to thirty Brāhmaṇas (named), who were called the grāma-svāmis of the village gifted. ~~In this case, the grāma-svāmis of the village gifted.~~ In this case, the grāma-svāmis were the share holders and the heads of the mahājana assembly. In A.D. 1290, it is recorded that Gaṅgavelli Malnāyaṇḍu and his brothers made a gift of the village of Kompalli for daily service of the god Svayambhū Sōmanāthadēva of Pērūru (Ibid, p.18). It may be said that Pērūru was, in addition to being a centre of trade, a place of learning and cultural activities. There were about three Brāhmin hamlets called agrahāras attached to the town. It was also a town of administrative importance being the divisional headquarters with a resident officer. Gifts made to the temples indicate the interest evinced by the local corporations in promoting a vigorous corporate life in the town.

ANUMAKOṆḌA OR ŌRUGALLU

Anumakoṇḍa and Waraṅgal (Ōrugallu) are in close proximity to one another. Kāzipet forms a part of Anumakoṇḍa. Anumakoṇḍa was the first capital of the Kākatīya kings. Later Waraṅgal, built by Rudradēva I, became his capital. This capital town and metropolis is selected here for its elaborate urban organisation. A record of A.D.872 appears to be the earliest one to refer to this town. It mentions Satyāśraya Bhīmarasa, mahāsāmanthādhipati, who obtained the privilege of using the five musical instruments. It

also records the grant of money to certain local officials and lays down fines for certain offences (WDI, No.1). In about A.D.1090, that is, after a lapse of nearly 218 years, it is stated that Kākatīya Bētarasa, the lord of Anumakoṇḍapura built a Śivapura to the south-west of the town and granted it to Rāmēśvara Paṇḍita along with the enjoyment of the income derived from natural hoards, customs, administration of justice, etc., as sarvamānya. The nakaramu of the city of Anumakoṇḍapaṭṭaṇa made a gift of one māna of oil every day for maintaining a perpetual lamp in the temple of the god Umā-Bētēśvara (Ibid, No.15). Then, in about A.D.1117, Mailama, the wife of Bēta constructed the Kudaḷālaya basadi on the top of the hill and made a gift of two mattars of wet land below the bund of the tank built by her husband, two martars of the black soil on the west of the tank and six martars of uncultivated land for the daily service in the temple and for the food, clothing etc. of the temple priest (Ibid,No.22). In the time of Vikramāditya VI, the Teliki-vēvuru and the seṭṭis made a gift to a certain god (Ibid, No.28). Another record states that Kākatīya Bētarasa set up a pillar on the occasion of the installation of the image of Varuna and gifted two irrigation tanks Kēsari-samudra and Seṭṭi-kaṛe for the enjoyment of the deity (Ibid, No.29). A Warangal Fort inscription refers to a saint called Guṇachandra mahāmunīśvara (Ibid, No.34). A Anumakoṇḍa epigraph mentions Rāmēśvara Paṇḍita who was proficient in the Lakulēśvara Āgama. King Tribhuvana-malla made a gift of the village Vaijanapalli converting it into a Śivapura. King Chalamartigaṇḍa Prōla, the disciple of Rāmēśvara Paṇḍita set up a kīrti-stambha in honour of his guru (Ibid, No.35). Again in about A.D. 1163, Kākatīya Rudradēva Mahārāja consecrated the

gods, Rudrēsvara, Vāsudēva and Sūryadēva and granted the village of Maddicheruvula for their worship (Ibid, No.36). In A.D. 1185, the gift of Maḍapalli dvandva together with gems, jewels and golden vessels was made to a temple of Śiva (Ibid, 41). Then in the time of Kākatīya Rudra, Gangādhara built a temple to the god Prasanna-Kēśava in Anumakoṇḍapuri (Ibid, 44). An undated record of the same period refers to the gift of certain taxes levied on some marketable articles by a nakhara. Again in about A.D. 1228, the mercantile bodies, such as the dēśi and the paradēśi merchants at Chiramaṭheya, the inhabitants of the vāḍas, the svadēsi, the paradēśi bēhāris and the ubhaya-nānādēśis, the nakaramu, the aśēsha (entire)-nakaramu, the samtha-nakaramu, the gandha-nakaramu and merchants trading in a variety of articles made a gift of incomes to the god Vīrabhadrēśvara (Ibid,No.63). In A.D.1245, Rudra of the Viriyāla family granted thirty cows for maintaining a perpetual lamp to the god Svayambhūdēva (Ibid, 65). A record of the time of Gaṇapatidēva, mentions that the nagara, trading in the five metals, the nagara of the perfumers, bachu-māde nakhara, ponkakude-nagarams and samta-nagara made gifts to the god Sōmānathadēva at Maṭiya-vāḍa (Ibid, 71). In A.D.1313 certain Kampus of the place made a gift of māḍas annually for the maintenance of the god Sahasralinga Gaṇapatīśvaradēva (Ibid, 89). In the time of Kākatīya Pratāparudradēva, a certain gift of incomes derived from the trees (of Palaila) is made to the god Mallēśvara of Pānugaṇṭi-vāḍa (Ibid, 93). A record of the same period states that Gojagi Īśvaradēva established the shrines of Chaturmukhadēvara, Umāmahēśvaradēvara, Āreṭidēvara and a thousand lingas in the Rudrēsvaram and granted to them 6 māḍas for their maintenance (Ibid, 94). Another record of the same period states that Nṛisimharishi composed the works known as the

Rikchhāya, a treatise on Śāstra and Kākatīya-charitra in eight sargas (chapters) (Ibid, 96). Again, the poet Narasimha is stated to have composed ten rūpakas (plays) and a prose work (gadya-kāvya) called Malayavati (Ibid, 97). A record refers to some metrical formula quoted from the gaṇas told by Narasimha (Ibid, 98). Other works of Narasimharishi, son of Visvēśvara Paṇḍita, the rājaguru of Kākatīya Rudradēvi are also mentioned (Ibid, Nos. 99 and 100).

The above mentioned records point out that the town attracted merchants from near and distant places. It was a centre of the merchants known as dēśi, paradēśi and ubhaya-nānādēśi. Anumakoṇḍa probably was a famous centre of the sthala-pekkaṁdru. The nagara or the town assembly consisted of the representatives of the merchants who were traders in a variety of articles. The Telikis, Kāṁpulu, the inhabitants of the vāḍas and officials of the place also took part in the organisation. The town assembly connected with the municipal administration at least from A.D.1090 and it continued to be so during the period under survey. Besides being a metropolis, it was also a centre of learning and cultural activities.

GAṄGĀPURAM

Gaṅgāpuram (Mahbūbnagar district) was another important town selected here for a study of its municipal organisation. There were a number of corporate bodies to look after its affairs. An inscription of the time of Western Chālukya king Trailōkyamalla Sōmēśvara I (A.D. 1042-68) mentions that Chāvaṇayya, brother-in-law of Sahavāsi Bhīvanayya who was the Great Minister, Officer in charge of Home Affairs and Commander of Forces, constructed a tank, the shrine of

Bhīmēsvara and planted a grove of trees. It also mentions grants of land to the deity. It further refers to the construction of a temple by Mallahaṇadēvi, who was an expert in dancing and the daughter of the Telugu Chōḍa prince Vaṅkarasa Chōla Mahārāja (APGAS, 3, No.25). An epigraph of the time of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI (A.D. 1076-1126) states that samasta seṭṭikāras and the ubhaya-nānādēśi made a gift of the collection of their samayas to the god Satyēśvaradēva (Ibid, 15, No.9). In A.D. 1091, Dēvarasa, Saṅdarasa and Lēcarasa gave the undertaking to pay certain dues in the presence of samasta-seṭṭikāras represented by Tribhuvanamalla Permāḍi seṭṭi, Jagadēkamalla Nūniseṭṭi, all the samayas and Kāvaṇa Herggaḍe the rājādhyaksha to the pura of the god Kēśavadēva (Ibid, No.11). Again in the same year, a certain Sakala Prakāśa Bhaṭṭaraka, who was proficient in several kinds of tarka-śāstras and the royal preceptor, made a gift of some land to Āditya Bhaṭṭōpādhyāya and Viddaṇa Bhaṭṭa, well-versed in astrology as Jyōti-vṛitti after examining them in Jyōti-śāstra (Ibid, 3, No.20). In A.D. 1116, the seṭṭikāras and the community of traders made a gift of income derived from tolls for the worship, offerings, etc. of the god Sakalēśvara (Ibid, No.17). In A.D. 1117, Mahāpradhāna Mahēśvara Daṇḍanāyaka made a gift of land and an oil-mill to the god Bhīmēśvara (Ibid, No.21). In A.D. 1134, the toll-officer of Kaṅdūr-nāḍu, other officials and the guild of the merchants made a gift of income derived from the Vaḍḍarāvuḷa and Hejjuṅka taxes to the god Sōmanātha (Ibid, No.24). In A.D. 1141, Makula Bappanna Mallika of Salladēvasvāmi, the sthānapati of the new settlement of Kōḍūr and a number of seṭṭis including the seṭṭikāras of the 36 vīḍus made a gift of land and dues to gods Sagarēśvaradēva and Kēśavadēva (Ibid, No.18). In A.D. 1143, the Five-hundred

representatives of samasta-nānādēśis made a gift of dues on certain commodities to the god Śrī Pojjēśvaradēva (Ibid, No.22). In A.D.1148, Kēśava setti, son of Tiruvi setti together with the mercantile community made a gift of one hāga for the pavitra ceremony of the god Sagarēśvara and another for the loin cloth of Rudraśakti Paṇḍita (Ibid, No.23). An undated record refers to the eminence of spiritual knowledge attained through contemplation by the ascetic Chūḍāmani presiding over the religious establishment of Mīnāmbara (Ibid, No.27).

These examples indicate that the head of the merchants was called setti. The merchants collected taxes for providing the people with civic amenities. There were both kinds of native and itinerant merchants who carried on trade in the town. Besides being a place of commercial importance, it was also a centre of learning. The place was dedicated to the worship of gods known as Bhīmēśvara, Satyēśvaradēva, Kēsavadēva, Salēśvara, Sōmanātha, Sagarēśvara and Pojjēśvaradēva. There was also one religious establishment intended to attain spiritual knowledge through contemplation. The royal officer, toll collectors and the merchant leaders figured prominently in the activities of the town.

NELLŌRE

Modern Nellōre was in medieval times known as Vikramasiṅgapuram. It became a prominent town during the 12th century A.D. It was the capital town of the Telugu Chōḍas and one of the important towns during the period of the later Chōḷas. It consisted of many quarters belonging to the Brāhmins, merchants, artisans, cultivators, weavers and others. There were temples dedicated to the worship of gods known as Chitramēlivinnagar or Paḷḷikoṇḍaperumāḷ, Sayyanārāyaṇa-

perumāḷ (NDI, II, N. 76), Talpagiri Raṅganāthasvāmi (Ibid, N.57), Manumasiddhēśvara (Ibid, N.91), Tirunāgēśvara (Ibid, N.51) Śrīvarāha Emberumān (Ibid, N.70), Sālīśvara (Ibid, N.81), Akkasālīśvara (Ibid, N.50), Nagarīśvara (Ibid, N.82) Gaṇapatīśvara (C.P. No.9 of 1918-19) and goddess Irukalā Paramēśvari (Ibid, N.78 and 80). There was also a maṭha attached to the town.

A record from Kōvūr of S.1112 appears to contain the earliest reference to Nellōre (Ibid, No.40). An epigraph of S.1119 of the reign of Kulōttuṅga Chōḷadēva (III) mentions that the inhabitants of a number of nāḍus assembled together at Nellōre to make a gift of land to the god Tiruppāṛkaḍar-Chitramēḷivinnagar (Ibid, N.55). In S.1202, two persons called Vaiṭumāpperumappiḷama and Pāmaṇḍi gave the interest on (certain amount deposited?) for an evening lamp to Paḷḷikoṇḍaperumāḷ (Ibid, 73). In S. 1239 of the reign of Kākatīya Pratāparudradēva, two persons (named) constructed a manṭapa for the merit of the viceroy of the king and for the timely rains thrice a month at Nellōre (Ibid, 80). In S.1286, while Vīra Śrī Savaṇṇa Oḍayalu was ruling the earth and Kānchaṇṇamgāru was the local officer (adhikāri), the people of different countries (nānādēśi), agreed to devote the fees raised in the market to provide all sorts of enjoyment for Irukalā Paramēśvari (Ibid, 78). In S.1322, a certain Puḷavadalvār constructed a big maṇḍapa in the temple of god Sayyanārāyaṇa Perumāḷ (Ibid, 76). In S.1495, Venkatappa Nāidu, the governor at Nellōre, made the sthala-karaṇams, kāpus, seṭṭis and pākareḍḍis to agree to the arrangement for showing respect to the Pañcāhanas during the festival days of god Paḷḷikoṇḍanātha in the same way as they were respected at Tirupati (Ibid, 54). An undated record (Ibid, 61) refers to a certain Sundara Pāṇḍya, who was a hero anointed in the

town of Nellōre. He also made a gift of the village of Māvaḍikuṇḍai for offerings to the deity in the hall constructed in his name called Sundarapāṇḍyasandi.

As stated elsewhere, the Chitramēḷi guild flourished in southern Āndhra with Nellōre as its headquarters, due to the influence of the later Chōḷas. There are inscriptions referring to the land gifts made free of taxes to the Chitramēḷi temple. The Chitramēḷi edicts (see references) from this town show that the guild flourished at Nellōre for more than hundred years (the first record was dated S.1119 and the last in S.1237).

Though information regarding its municipal organisation is meagre, the above mentioned records indicate that the town administration was carried on by an assembly consisting of local corporations, such as the merchants, the artisans, the cultivators, sthala-karaṇams pākareḍḍis, local officials and others. Gifts made to the temples, as listed above, also indicate the corporate life of the people in the town.

Each temple appears to have had its own establishment. Apart from others, there was a seṭṭi attached to the temple (Ibid, 63). Gifts made to the temples were kept under the protection of the Mahēśvaras (Ibid, 51). Kitti Āḷavān and Perumāḷ (goldsmiths) were the trustees of the gifts of the temple of Akkasālīśvara (Ibid, 51). The Sivabrāhmaṇas named Srīmādēvabhaṭṭa, Madānugraha-Charaṇabhaṭṭa, Āṭkoṇḍapiḷḷai and Sittāṇḍār looked after the gifts made to the temple of Manumasiddhēśvara (Ibid, 87). In another gift made to the same temple, the trustees were Āṭakoṇḍapiḷḷai, Siddāṇḍār and Bharadvāja

Mahādēva. Vaiṭumāpperumappiḷama and Pāmaṇḍi acted as trustees of the gifts made to the temple of Paḷḷikoṇḍaperumāḷ (Ibid, 73).

ALAMPUR

The earliest inscription of this place belongs to the reign of Vikramāditya I (A.D. 665-680) (AS, 39, p.21). Again it is mentioned in an epigraph of the time of Govinda III (A.D. 794-814), which states that the Āditya temple at Uttarēśvara was built by Srīmati, son of Bōtiya Beṅga, and head of 300 Okkaligas (CTI, iv, No.4). For about two centuries, there are no records in Alampur. Then in A.D. 1057, Lōkamāṇikaseṭṭi, the suṅka-verggaḍa (customs minister), while Brahmarāsi-bhaṭṭāraka, the mahāsthānādhipati (chief priest) of Brahmēśvaradēva was managing the affairs of the temple, made a gift of the customs dues of nālkū-nāḍu (the four nāḍu) for a perpetual lamp etc., in the temple (AS, 39, No.4). In A.D. 1060, perggaḍe Dēvapayya granted to Lokābharaṇa Paṇḍita of the Nakarēśvara temple as Paramēśvara-datti, 17 martars of black field (kariya-keyi) for imparting education and a flower garden in the parisūtra (enclosure) of Bhujaṅgēśvaradēva (Ibid, No.6). In 1067, while the Western Chālukya king Trailōkyamalladēva was ruling the kingdom and his subordinate Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Chiddana Chōḷa Mahārāja was governing Ayje-three hundred, Kosanārya Preggaḍa, saudhare of Ayje-three hundred, Gōvindarāja and several gāuṇḍas, seṭṭis and the prabhus of of Ayje-nāḍu, having assembled together, made a gift of one gold gadyāṇa in every village of the Ayje-three hundred for the service of the god Brahmēśvaradēva and white-washing and conducting repairs of the temple (Ibid, No.7). In A.D. 1073, Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Chiddana Chōḷa Mahārāja, who was governing the four nāḍus of Kanne-300,

Pedakallu-800, Naravādi-500 and Ayje-300 as bīdavitti established at the western gate of Srīsaila, Eravagēri in Alampūr for his service as Paramēśvaradatti (Ibid, No.8). In A.D. 1076, Vaddarāvula Dandanāyaka, Nāranayya who bears the titles of vidhāna-niyōgi-nidhāra and ubhaya-deśi-manōrañjana, made a gift of the vaddarāvula of the four nādus for his ranga-bhōga, white-washing, conducting repairs, etc., to the god Brahmēśvaradēva (Ibid, No.9). In A.D.1078, Mahāmandalēśvara Mallamahārāja of the Vaidumba family, who bears among others the title of Tribhuvanamalladēva-ankakāra, gave the village of Anganavāvi for the ranga-bhōga and worship of the god Brahmēśvaradēva (Ibid,No.11). In A.D. 1085, a gift of land was made in the presence of the merchant community and the sthānapati of Brahmapuri (APGAS, 3, p.37). Then in about A.D. 1182, the mercantile bodies known as the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvole, ubhaya-nānādeśis, Nummuridandas of 36 vīdus, Kannada-4000 and the heads of several sthalas like Tumbula, Gobbūr, Aiza, Nayikallu, Lagōmpūra, Muntalagōdu, Madūra and Alampūr made a gift of income derived from tolls on various transactions to the god Gaurēśvara (No.157 of 1959-60). Again in A.D. 1299, the heads of the samasta-pekkamdru, who were called the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Samaya-Dharma, namely, Alampūr Mummadi Brammisetti Prithvīsetti, nāda-nāluka Siriyālasetti, Delavādi Brammisetti, Badavara Beli Celidēvi-setti, Mimdaguddali Amnnisetti, pattanasvāmi Ravalisetti, Brammisetti, Prōlisetti of Pākanādu, Prithuvaya Timdaka Vādi Brammisetti, Pindibāsetti, Phalavādi Kesetti, Phalavādi Nārapa Jōgisetti, Lakhaya Sikharada Dhīlisetti, Kōdūri Hegada Gessetti, Rēvaka Nāgisetti, Vattam Pōcena-setti and others made a gift of land for the personal and public enjoyment of the god

Gauresvara and the Jaina saints (CTI, II, p.167). An undated record mentions a gift of 400 martars of gadde-land to the ascetics of the Kalamukha matha attached to the temple of Sidha Somesvara of Alampur (AS, 39, No.10).

A study of the records of Alampur shows how by gradual stages it became a big centre of religious, administrative and commercial activities. The story begins with the Brahmesvara temple in the Early Chalukya times, which brought the town into prominence. The Aditya temple of Rashtrakuta times increased its religious importance. In course of time it appears to have become the centre of Kalamukha Saivism in the temple of Siddha Somesvara. Meanwhile it also became the administrative capital of the four nadus known as Kanne-300, Pedakallu-800, Naravadi-500 and Ayje-300 and various sthalas. Simultaneously its commercial importance began to grow attracting to it the ubhaya-nanadesi, Mummuridandas and the pekkamdru merchant guilds.

The heads of guilds, the representatives of the nalku-nadu, the chief priest of the temple, local officials and other prominent leaders of the place took an active part in the municipal organisation of the town. The Brahmesvara temple was managed by a body of trustees, the chief of them was called mahasthanadhipati.

CHAPTER VI

GUILD ASSEMBLIES

SECTION: 1

INTRODUCTORY

Guild assemblies ~~were also the assemblies of the town. They~~ were of two kinds known as the merchant guild and the craft guilds* The merchant guild of the Vīra Balañjas (Nānādēśi) and the craft guilds, such as the Teliki-1000 and the Pañcāhanaṃvāru are described below.

THE VĪRA BALAÑJAS (NĀNĀDĒŚI)

The merchants who were known as the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma organised themselves into a number of autonomous trade guilds during the period. These merchants were not confined to the geographical limits of Āndhra but were to be found practically in all places of commercial importance in Āndhra, Karnāṭaka and Tamilnāḍu. There are inscriptions referring to trade guilds, namely, the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe, the Ubhaya-nānādēśi-pekkaṃdru, the Mummuridaṇḍas and the Gavaṛes as the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Samaya-Dharma. While trade was the main function of these guilds, they performed a number of other ancilliary functions also. They possessed their own praśasti, insignia and traditions. They exerted influence over the allied communities at different places.

Records from Nāyakallu of S.889, Polasa of AD.1108, Chintapalli of S.1162, Kūcimañci of S.1182, Yenamadala of S.1191, Tripurāntakam of S.1214, Alampūr of S.1225, Chittāpūr of the reign of Kākatīya Pratāparudradēva, Peddakaḍumūru of the reign of Kālachūri king

---

* Doctors R. Narasimha Rao (1967), K. Sundaram (1968) and Sri M.S. Sarma (1948) ~~were~~ the ~~first~~ to refer to these guilds in medieval Āndhra.

Ahavamalladēva and Taṅgeḍa of the reign of Komaragiri Reḍḍi contain several details of the prasasti of the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Samaya-Dharma.

Samaya means guild. Dharma means a code of conduct. Vīra-Balañja-Samaya-Dharma means the code of fair conduct to be followed in mercantile business by the members of the guild of the Vīra-Balañjas. Hence the expression "samasta-bhuvana-vikhyāta-vīra-Balañja-samaya-dharma-pratipālakulu".

Vīra-śāsanas may mean either the edicts of knights or the edicts of privileges. As the Vīra-Balañjas were the merchants of good conduct, the Vīra-śāsanas (mentioned in the praśasti) may mean the edicts of privileges enjoyed by these merchants in trade and commerce. Hence their claim "samasta-bhuvana-jana-vikhyāta-paṁcāśata-vīra-śāsana-labdhānēka-guṇa-gaṇālaṁkrutulu".

The praśasti indicates that there was a gradation of guilds, ranging from town organisation to regional federations. The guilds, for example, were:

1. Dēśi or Swadēśi denotes the guild of local or native merchants. It was probably also known as the Nagara.
2. Paradēśi means the guild of itinerant merchants.
3. Sthala-pekkaṁdru may mean the guild of merchants pertaining to a sthala or nāḍu.
4. Ubhaya-nānādēśi may mean the guild of both kinds of native (dēśi) and itinerant (nānādēśi or paradēśi) merchants of local and neighbouring territories.
5. Chālumūla-ubhaya-nānādēśi-pekkaṁdru may mean the guild of merchants coming from local, neighbouring and distant

places. It seems to have been the equivalent of the Tamil Nānādēśi-tisaiāyirattu-Ainnūrruvar.

SECTION: 2

SOME MERCHANT COMMUNITIES

The merchant guilds played an important role in the economic life of the country even from the very early period. The antiquity of trade guilds in Āndhra may be traced back to the period of the Sātavāhanas. The guilds became popular institutions of organisation, influence and authority during the medieval period. Dr. Maity, S.K. (1957, p.155) writes that "the hereditary nature of trades and occupations helped a great deal in the formation of guilds and corporations". The guild was a voluntary association of individuals earning their livelihood by the same kind of labour. Its features were the sameness of occupation, free choice of membership, common code of ethics, equal rights and mutual protection. The guilds, like those of the ancient Śrenis, enjoyed freedom in all matters of trade and exerted influence over the life of the members. They exercised certain powers of taxation, carried on banking operations, maintained common property and preserved self-government in trade. The following are the merchant communities mentioned in the praśasti.

THE FIVE HUNDRED SVĀMIS OF AYYĀVOLE

The merchants who called themselves the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe constituted an important trading community of the period. Ayyāvoḷe (modern Aihole in Bijapur district) was said to be their headquarters. Bali-grāma was another famous centre. They were known as the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma. They also called

themselves Nānādēśi or Ainnurrūvar. They possessed a distinct organisation and made their own regulations.

These merchants said about themselves that they were born to wander across many countries. They had many sub-divisions among them. They claimed to have been coming from the 56 countries or the 64 ghaṭikasthānās. They also claimed to have possessed many privileges and titles.

They had the flag of Garuḍa, the banner of a hill and the seal of Mahishāsura-mardhini. They maintained mercenary soldiers to protect their merchandise in transit and at warehouses.

These merchants were adepts in trade, perfect in śāstras and experts in the testing of the navaratnās and vāhanās like horses and elephants. They were also skilled in 64 arts. They traded in a variety of articles at different centres of trade.

Fleet (JBBRAS, X, p.286) says that the term Banañju is the corruption of the Sanskrit Vaṇija or Vanijika, denoting a merchant or trader. T.V. Mahalingam (1951, p.30) opines that the modern term Banyan is derived from Balañja. These merchants appeared to have evolved into an endogamous sect and came to be known as Balijās in Āndhra and Banajigās in Karnāṭaka.

The expression "the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe", means merchants. Ayyāvoḷe being an abode of originally 500 scholars, a capital town and a seat of cultural activities, was ~~to be considered~~ a commercial centre and the birth place of merchants. These merchants appeared to have made a name for themselves in trade for fair-dealing and philanthropy. In course of time, merchants at different places claimed that they came from Ayyāvoḷe in order to appropriate for

themselves the good will established by the earlier Ayyāvoḷe merchants. Hence the reason that the merchants in their praśasti identified themselves with Ayyāvoḷe and called themselves as the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma or the code of fair conduct among merchants. It may be said that the number refers to Ayyāvoḷe only. It does not mean that the merchants at Ayyāvoḷe were five hundred in number, who organised a vast commercial corporation with its headquarters at Ayyāvoḷe and with its branches all over South India. The Ayyāvoḷe merchants probably spread to several places of commercial importance.

THE MUMMURIDAṆḌAS

These merchants constituted another important mercantile body. They hailed from Karnāṭaka. Ayyāvoḷe was also said to be their headquarters. They possessed 36 trade centres at 36 vīdus (centres of trade). They were worshippers of god Gavarēśvara.

These merchants probably carried a weapon resembling Triśūla with them. They were also the advance-guard of the trading caravan. Hence these merchants were known as Mummuriḍaṇḍas (History, p.396). They were known for their brave qualities. They protected those who sought their help and punished the wicked. They considered themselves as brothers to the wives of others, as is evident from the expression "raṇa-raṅga-Rāmulu" (SII, IX(i), Nos.296 and 297).

THE GAVARES

The Gavares were called so because they were the worshippers of god Gavarēśvara. They also belonged to Karnāṭaka. Ayyāvoḷe was also said to be their headquarters. Like other merchants, they came to Āndhra with the purpose of trade. They were good merchants. They gave gifts for charitable purposes.

THE PARADEŚI

The Paradēśi were itinerant merchants. The Warangal epigraph of A.D.1228 refers to the Paradēśi merchants. Records from Kistnapaṭam of A.D.1256 and A.D.1279 also refer to these merchants. They claimed to have been coming from the 18 countries. These merchants probably correspond to the Dvīpāntara-Vyavahārulu mentioned in the Mōṭupalli inscription of S.1280.

THE UBHAYA-NĀNĀDEŚI

The merchants from the neighbouring places came to the Telugu country for making profit in trade during the period. They were known as the Nānādēśi. These merchants appeared to have formed themselves into separate units. The merchants of Karnāṭaka were known by the name of the guilds to which they belonged, such as the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe, the Mummuridaṇḍas and the Gavares. The merchants of Tamilnāḍu called themselves as Nānādēśi-tisaiāyirattai-nnūṟṟuvar or Ainnūṟṟuvar. The towns like Alampūr, Animala, Chintapalli, Chittāpūr, Drākshārāma, Gangāpuram, Hemavati, Peddakaḍu-mūru, Polasa, Suravaram, Tangeḍa, Tripurāntakam, Tumbulam, Warangal and Yenamadala were the centres of merchants coming mostly from Karnāṭaka, while the coastal towns, such as Gaṇapēśvaram, Ghaṇṭasāla, Kistnapaṭam, Mōṭupalli, Nellōre, Simhachalam and Visākhapaṭnam were the centres of merchants coming mostly from Tamilnāḍu. These merchants joined hands with the native merchants and called themselves the Ubhaya-Nānādēśi.

Some of the port towns of Andhra were given both Tamil and Kannaḍa names. Ghaṇṭasāla was known as Chōḷa-Pāṇḍya-Puram, Kāḷahasti

as Mummaḍichōḷapuram, Mōtupalli as Dēśyūyakoṇḍapaṭṭaṇam, Nellōre as Abhinava-Dvārāvati or Chikka Ayyāvoḷe and Visākhapaṭnam as Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷapaṭṭanam. Hēmavati, Nellōre, Pērūru and Waraṅgal were the centres which attracted the merchants, apart from others, both from Karnāṭaka and Tamilnāḍu. These examples show that the commerce of Andhra passed into the hands of Nānādēśis. The Tamil merchants were the most prominent among those who were engaged in the overseas commerce, whereas the Kannaḍa merchants dominated the inland trade of the Telugu country.

THEIR LEADERS

Each constituent merchant community had its own head. These heads were known by different titles. One was known as Vaḍḍavyavahāri or senior merchant. According to the Hemavati record a certain Sikkaluḍaiya Seṭṭiyār was Vaḍḍavyavahāri, a Nānādēśi and a member of the "500 Valiant men" of Ayyāvoḷe. The chief head probably was known as Mahāvaḍḍavyavahāri (big merchant), who was the leader of the Ubhaya-nānādēśi as mentioned in the records of Sarajammanahalli and Kammaṛachōḍu. The second one was called the Prithvīseṭṭi (the great merchant). The epigraph from Alampūr of S.1225 mentions that the head of the Sthala-pekkaṁdru, also called the Ubhaya-nānādēśi, was Brammiseṭṭi, who had the title of Prithvīseṭṭi. Another one from Drākshārāma of S.1366 also refers to a certain Aṅka Teluṅgariseṭṭi, who was protector of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma and the Prithvīseṭṭi of the Pekkaṁḍru (merchants) at that place. As already mentioned the third appellation was the Samaya-Chakravarti. The fourth title was the Dharmōpadēśa-karta (spokesman of the guild). The record from Chittāpūr mentions that Bēriseṭṭi was Vīra-Balañja-Dharmōpadēśa-

karta (the head of the Vīra-Balañja-Samaya-Dharma) at Chittāpūr. The fifth one was Vīra-Balañja-Dharmapratiṣṭāchārya as stated in the record of Kūcimañci of S.1182.

THEIR MEETINGS

The venue of their meetings was the mukhamaṇḍapa of a temple or a shop. Records from Chintapalli of S.1162 and Tripurāntakam of S.1214 refer to the temple as the place of meetings. While the inscription from Gaṅgāpuram dated A.D.1143 mentions the arecanut shop, the record from Boggaram of S.1323 refers to the mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple as the venue of meetings. Usually the mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple was selected as the place of meeting, because it was spacious to accommodate all the members present, and the decisions taken in the presence of the deity to whom the merchants had been devoted were obeyed without fail by all members residing at different places. As mentioned elsewhere, a representative meeting of the Vīra-Balañjas was known as the Mahānāḍu.

The purpose of the meeting was to transact the business called Balañja-kārya or rāca-kārya. Besides the work pertaining to the promotion of trade, they considered in the meetings several measures of corporate life. Sometimes meetings were held for the purpose of granting gifts of land or taxes on goods to temples. Meetings were also held for the purpose of settling disputes of the merchants. Some meetings were held to reward the meritorious services rendered to the guild by certain members. Meetings were also held to enter into agreements among themselves.

THEIR CENTRES OF TRADE

As mentioned elsewhere, the rise and growth of towns contributed

to the promotion of trade and commerce. The temple, which was the centre of cultural activities, also fostered trade. While the towns developed round the temples, commerce developed around the towns. Some of these centres were Alampūr, Animala, Bhōgapuram, Boggaram, Chintapalli, Chittāpūr, Darsi, Drākshārāma, Durgi, Gangāpuram, Gōrantla, Hēmāvati, Katukūru, Kistnapatam, Kucimanci, Mōtupalli, Nangegadda, Nāyakallu, Nellōre, Pedakadumūr, Polasa, Rājasāvaram, Sarajammanahalli, Sārangupalli, Suravaram, Tangatūru, Tangeda, Tripurāntakam, Vīrūru, Warangal (Ōrugallu) and Yenamadala.

THEIR ARTICLES OF TRADE

The inscriptions from Alampūr, Animala, Gangāpūr, Hēmāvati, Mōtupalli, Tangeda, Tripurāntakam, Warangal and Yenamadala mention the articles with which these merchants carried on trade. They included all types of goods, such as all kinds of grains and pulses (nava-dhānyālu), arecanuts, artificial hair, barks, betel-leaves, camphor, camphor-oil, cardamoms, china-camphor, cloth, cloves, civet, coconuts, copper, corals, cotton, cots, cosmetics, cōlam, cuscus, diamonds, drugs, elephants, fruits, ghee, glass beads, ginger, gingelly, gold, honey, horses, indigo, ivory, kumkuma, lapis-lazuli, lead, musk, oil, pearls, perfumes, paints, precious and semi-precious stones, pepper and other spices, paddy, paper, rice, rose-water, sandal, saffron, salt, silk-thread, silver, tamarind, tin, topaz, turmeric, vegetables, zink and many other wares.

SECTION: 3

FUNCTIONS OF THE GUILD OF THE VĪRABALAÑJAS:

Trade

The Vīra-Balañjas conducted trade in the fairs held at

different places. The inscriptions from Animala, Taṅgeḍa, Tripurāntakam, Waraṅgal and Yenamadala show that they were busy in the conduct of internal trade. The Animala record of S.1453 (No.202) refers to several articles of merchandise passing through the routes, such as the *Ādi-mārga* or *Bhāra-mārga*, *Gaṇḍikanuma*, *Pulivendla-kanuma* and *Chinta-kanuma*. This record shows the means of communications and indicates that trade was carried mostly on the land routes. The merchants used carts, donkeys, buffaloes and oxen for the purpose of transporting their merchandise. They sold the merchandise wholesale or by hawking about with the goods on their shoulders. The term *samaya-kārya* or *Balañja-kārya* may be understood in the context of the promotion of trade by the guild.

CONTROL OVER CUSTOMS

The Vīra-Balañjas acted as farmers of tolls during the period, as it is evident from the following examples. The Gaṅgāpuram record of S.1065 registers that the 500 ~~representatives of~~ of the *Nānādēśi* trading community made the gift of income derived from tolls on goods to the god Pojjēśvaradēva. The record from Durgi of S.1191 mentions that the *Chālumūla-Ubhaya-Nānādēśi-pekkaṁḍru* made a gift of *suṅkamu* (toll) on all goods at the rate of *vīsāmu* per *gadyānana* (*varāha*) to the temple of Gopīnātha. The Nellōre record of S.1286 states that the *Nānādēśi* made a gift of certain fees to be collected at the fair to the goddess Erakula-Paramēśvari. The Taṅgeḍa record of S.1313 mentions that the *Nānādēśi-pekkaṁḍru* made the gift of tolls collected at the ferry to the temple of Narasimha. The inscription from Chittāpūr states that Bērisetṭi of the *Vīra-Balañja* community made a gift of tolls levied on the articles sold at Peddapariyala. The record from Animala of S.1453 records that

the Vīra-Balañjas made the gift of toll-incomes (magama) on goods to the gods Saṅgameśvara and Vīrabhadra. These records show that the guild exercised control over the custom duties, such as suṅkamu, magama or āyamu or bīraṇa on all kinds of goods sold at villages, towns, ferries, fairs and the mountain passes. The guild collected tolls both for the state and the guild. A Drākshārāma record of S.1366 refers to virālam-pannu collected for the purpose of rāca-kārya and Balañja-kārya by the Balañja-pekkaṃdru. The term virālamu might denote contribution, which was collected for the guild. Pannu might denotes tax, which was collected for the state. Thus the guild controlled the customs on the trade and commerce; otherwise, it could not grant either exemption from the payment of tolls or make the gift of the incomes derived on tolls. It acted as an agent of the state with regard to the transactions pertaining to the trade and commerce. It was the connecting link between the merchants and the government.

ARBITRATOR

The guild acted as an arbitrator in settling disputes among its members. An undated inscription from Bezawāḍa mentions an important money transaction settled in the presence of the Sūravaram-pekkaṃdru. It states that a certain Mollagumṭṭa Kūniseṭṭi borrowed a sum of 1200 Taṅkas from Kumāra Telumgurāyuḍu for interest (rate of interest not mentioned) and Pinakūnu Bācābattuḍu stood surety for the borrower. Consequent on the failure of the debtor to return the principal amount with interest, the creditor collected his money from the surety. The latter then made an appeal to the Sūravaram-pekkaṃdru against the breach of trust of Kūṇiseṭṭi. The pekkaṃdru assembled together to settle the dispute between the surety

and the borrower (members of the pekkamdru). The parties concerned were present. The assembly decided that Kūnisetti should execute a bond to Bācābattudu for the money he had paid to the creditor and should surrender his religious merit acquired by performing several good acts of philanthropy, such as the construction of a tank and a garden at Ākiripalli, worship of several gods and help given to the Brāhmins to enable them to perform upanayanams and marriages in lieu of the interest accrued thereafter (Sūravarampekkamdra-mumdaram-jēcina-niranayam-modali-dhanānaku-patramicci-vaddī-dhanānakai-nējēcina-sugrutālu-yiṅtavatu-nīku-yistini). This record shows that the merchant-guild had the right to hold a court of enquiry and settle the disputes that arose among its members. It discharged certain judicial responsibilities. It regulated the conduct of its members by upholding their position in the society. It may be noted that the guild transferred the religious merit acquired by one individual to the other in lieu of the latter's help to the former. It was a singular event. ~~in its nature.~~

RECALCITRANT MEMBERS

The guild punished the recalcitrant persons either members or non-members, if they disobeyed its regulations or encroached upon its rights. A Nellōre copper-plate of S.1225 records that the Nānādēsi-pekkamdru of the Nandyāla-sthala granted the privilege to trade in certain articles without paying duty to a certain Puliyamasetti as a reward for having killed Kārapākala Kātināyaka who had become a traitor to the samaya. ~~(offence not mentioned).~~ Kārapākala Kātināyaka most probably encroached upon the rights and privileges of the guild. Puliyamasetti served the guild by killing

a traitor of the samaya. Another record from the same place of S.1244 mentions that the same organisation of traders granted a similar privilege to a certain Attena as a reward for having killed Annamarāja and Siṅgarāja, the suṅka-karṇās (toll accountants) of Cheruṇūru in Pedakaṇṭidēśa ~~(offence not mentioned)~~. These toll officers probably caused a great deal of hindrance to "samaya-kārya" of the Nānādēśi-pekkaṁdru by imposing certain restrictions upon them. Thus they offended the Nānādēśi by their unjust harassment. Hence the reason that these traitors of the "samayas" were put to death. These records show that the guild employed its own persons to protect its rights and privileges. It rewarded those who rendered service to the guild. An inscription from Pedakaḍumūru states that the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma entered into an agreement, and whoever violated it were either fined or expelled from the guild. These examples show that the Nānādēśi had enjoyed under its jurisdiction the exclusive right of imposing punishments upon those who went against its rights and agreements. ~~It exercised a kind of judicial authority. It enjoyed liberty in all commercial transactions.~~

TO CONFER TITLES

It appears that an aspect of the samaya-kārya was to get co-operation and support of the local authorities for the smooth conduct of trade. The record from Chiṅtapalli of S.1162 refers to the Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Chāgi Dorayarāja who was entitled Prithvīseṭṭi. He was a feudal chief and not a merchant. Hence his title was only an honorific, perhaps, conferred on him by the guild in recognition of his help, in the same way as the Vīra-Balañja merchants did on a certain Muddaya Dannāyaka at Bēlūr in contemporary Karṇāṭaka.

K UNIVE ... AR

TEMPLE AFFAIRS

The Nānādēśi merchants built temples. The Bhōgapuram record of S.1100 mentions the construction of Rājarāja-Jinālaya at Bhōgapuram, called Nānādēśi-Vikramagaṅga-Vīrapeṇṭa. The epigraph from Chittāpūr mentions that Bērisetṭi, the head of the Vīra-Balañja community, installed in the village Peddapariyāla the gods Bairēśvara, Sakalēśvara and Nāgēśvara. The Nellōre copper plate records that Mallisetṭi constructed the temple of Gaṇapēśvara at Nellōre. The Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe granted as sarvamānya, the exemption of the tolls, suṅka, magama and bīraṇa, on 50 packages on bullocks, buffaloes or asses as a reward for undertaking this work of constructing the temple for the promotion of religious activity.

GIFTS TO TEMPLES

The protectors of the Vīra-Balañja Samaya-Dharma made ~~made~~ collective or individual gifts for offering daily service in the temples as shown below.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	Name of the Temple
1.	Nāyakallu	S. 889	Gaurēśvaradēva
2.	Gaṅgāpuram	S.1013	Kēśavadēva
3.	Gaṅgāpuram	of the reign of Vikramāditya VI	Satyēśvaradēva
4.	Gaṅgāpuram	S.1056	Sōmanāthadēva
5.	Gaṅgāpuram	S.1063	Sagarēśvaradēva
6.	Gaṅgāpuram	S.1065	Pojjēśvaradēva
7.	Hēmavati	12th century A.D.	Maṅgēśvaradēva
8.	Alampūr	S.1104	Gaurēśvara

9.	Chintapalli	S.1162	Mallikārjunadēva at Guḍimeṭṭa
10.	Yenamadala	S.1173	Gōpālasvāmi
11.	Kūchimanci	S.1182	Gōpīnāthadēva
12.	Durgi	S.1191	Gōpināthadēva
13.	Yenamadala	S.1191	Gaṇēśvaradēva
14.	Tripurāntakam	S.1192	Tripurāntaka Mahādēva
15.	Tripurāntakam	S.1214	Tripurāntaka Mahādēva
16.	Tripurāntakam	S.1218	Tripurāntaka Mahādēva
17.	Srīkākulam	S.1220	Śrīvallabhadēva
18.	Alampūr	S.1221	Bhōgēśvara
19.	Rājasāvaram	S.1223	Śrīparvatanātha, Śivadēva, Elēśvaradēva, Sōmanātha at Pērūru, Tipurāntakadēva at Piḍukuṛāla, Malnāthadēva at Rājavaram etc.,
20.	Alampūr	S.1225	Brahmēśvara
21.	Kaṭukūru	S.1225	Gōpīnāthadēva
22.	Warangal	A.D.1228	Vīrabhadrēśvara
23.	Tangeḍa	S.1230	Rāmanāthadēva
24.	Nellōre	S.1286	Goddess Eṛakula-Paramēśvari
25.	Tripurāntakam	S.1309	Mahādēva
26.	Tangeḍa	S.1313	Narasimha, Goddess Lakshmi etc.,
27.	Boggaram	S.1323	Goddess Guṟṟāla-Paramēśvari
28.	Drākshārāma	S.1366	Bhīmēśvaradēva
29.	Animala	S.1453	Sangamēśvara and Vīrabhadra
30.	Tangeḍa	of the reign of Komaragiri Reḍḍi	Gōpīnāthadēva
31.	Nellōre	Undated	Gaṇapēśvaradēva

TANKS AND GARDENS

The Bezawāḍa record as mentioned above states that Kūnisetṭi, a member of the Sūravarampekkaṁḍru, constructed a tank and a garden. The Chittāpūr epigraph records that the tank, sakala-samudra was constructed by Bērisetṭi of the Vīra-Balañja community. An Appāpuram record of S.1327 states that Vallabhisetṭi, lord of Ayyāvoḷe, built a tank, called Gōvardhana-samudramu.

LAND GIFTS

Records from Gaṅgāpuram of S.1063, Bhōgapuram of S.1100, Hēmavati of 12th century, Kūcimañci of S.1182, Alaṁpūr of S.1225, Taṅgeḍa of the reign of Komaragiri Reḍḍi and one undated one from Chiṁtapalli mention land gifts made by the members of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma. The record from Alaṁpūr of S.1221 says that the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja Samaya Dharma, whose names are enumerated together with the Samastha-pekkaṁḍru of Alaṁpūr, purchased some land and granted it to the temple of Gaurēśvaradēva. This record shows that, whenever land gifts were made, the merchants purchased the land for the said purpose from its owner. But the records do not state the authority which the land gifts were entrusted with. The Chittāpūr inscription, as mentioned above, states that Bērisetṭi endowed the temples at Peddapariyala with one-third of the produce in the land irrigated under the tank sakala-samudramu.

TRUSTEESHIP

The guild served not only as the custodian of the public property but also as witness to the gifts for the promotion of ear-marked corporate purposes. While making gifts, its permission was obtained. The Gaṅgāpuram record of S.1013 refers to the

undertaking to pay the gift of income derived from specified tolls to the temple of god Kēśava by Dēvarasa, Sandarasa and Lecarasa in the presence of samasta-seṭṭikaras (all members of the mercantile community) headed by Tribhuvanamalla Permādiseṭṭi and Jagadēkamalla Ṇeniseṭṭi of all the samayas and Kāvaṇa Herggaḍe, the rājādhyaksha (officer). Another record from the same place of S.1070 mentions that Kēśavaseṭṭi made the gift of one hāga for the pavitra ceremony of the god Sagarēśvara and another for the loin cloth of Rudraśakti Paṇḍita with the approval of the mercantile community. In this case, the guild looked after the gift. Thus the guild of merchants looked after the work connected with the continuation of the gifts made by its members.

BONDS OF UNITY

The Vīra-Balañjas maintained unity by promoting the sense of oneness among the members. Any deviation from the principles of samaya-dharma meant the punishment of the members. Offenders of the agreements were either fined or kept under strict social ostracism. While the Pedakaḍumūru record imposed fine upon them, the Yenamadala record of S.1191 declared them as traitors of the guild. Records from Bhōgapuram of S.1100 and Tripurāntakam of S.1214 and S.1218 regarded them to have committed the five great sins, drunk from the skull of their eldest son, killed cows, sages and Brāhmins on the bank of the river Gaṅges and to have been condemned to different kinds of hell. In extreme cases, the offender was considered a traitor to God, king and Creed. If any member concealed his income (from the guild), his race was cursed to become childless. These examples show the closeness of the bonds of unity among the Vīra-

Balañjas and their devotion to the samaya-dharma.

GUILD ARMY

As stated above, the guild maintained mercenary armies to protect the merchandise in transit and at warehouses. The Bisinikonda record of A.D.1050 mentions that the Ubhaya-Nānādēsi maintained regiments of foot-soldiers and swordmen, known as Eri-Vīras, Munai-Vīras, Ilañjinga-Vīras and Kangavālas. This army of the guild was known as samaya-sēna and its head as samaya-sēnāpati (commander of the guild army). The Bāpatla record of S.1071 records that a certain Kannisetti was the samaya-sēnāpati of the guild, called the Gangēyarāya-samaya. (Gangēyarāya was Gonka II of Velanādu). The army of the guild, either local or federal, was named after the king, as a practice the aim of which was to maintain cordial relations with the kings in whose dominions the Ubhaya-Nānādēsi carried on trade.

SECTION: 4

THE STATE AND THE VĪRA BALAÑJAS

The Vīra Balañjas, who were a powerful corporation of merchants during the period, enjoyed royal favours and support. The royal support meant safety to the merchandise and economic freedom in all matters of trade. The Mōtupalli records of S.1166 and S.1280 provide us with ample testimony to their abilities in bargaining concessions in trade as well as maintaining close relations with the ruling dynasties from time to time. As already mentioned, they also gave the names of the kings to their guilds, armies and temples. While the temple at Nellōre was named Ganapēśvara (Kākatīya Ganapatidēva), the temple at Kistnapatam was called Manumasiddhēśvara (the Telugu Cōda king Manumasiddhi). While Kannisetti was the

commander of the army of the guild, called Kulōttuṅga Cōḍa Gaṅgēya-rāya Samaya, Cirukūri Appana Rāma was the Rājarāja Samaya Chakravarti of 18 Bhūmi (Rājarāja was Rājarāja II, son of Kulōttuṅga I). Mitākṣara also enjoins upon kings the important duty of preserving the rules of conduct of the trade guilds. Hence the justification of the statement of the king Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva (the object of his abhayaśāsana) that "protection (of my subjects) is far more important (to me) than my life. We have remitted . . . all (taxes) except kūpasulka (a customs duty) on these enterprising (merchants) trading on sea in order to. . . . maintain the principles of a righteous Government". Thus the spirit of co-operation among the merchants and the cardial relations between the state and the guild led to their remarkable success in the organisation of the guild at different places, prosperity in life and continuous record of marvellous achievements in ~~the~~ trade and commerce.

SECTION: 5

BALAÑJAS AND OTHER LOCAL BODIES

The Balañja merchants co-operated with the other local bodies in order to attend to the common needs. The Kaṭukūru record of S.1225 mentions that the eighteen communities such as the Mahājanas, the Nagaramu, the Kāṁpulu and the Balañja merchants joined together to make the gift of some land to the temple of Śrīgōpīnāthadēva. The Sāraṅgupalle record of S.1230 also states that the eighteen samayas and the Ubhaya-Nānādēśi-pekkaṁdru together made the gift to the same temple. Another Taṅgeḍa record of S.1313 says that the Mahājanas of Būdavāḍa Agrahāra and Anuṅgupalli Agrahāra made the gift of land (specified), whereas the Yekkadilu (officials?) of Taṅgeḍa made over a part

of their wages as gift. The Nānādēśi-pekkamḍru made the gift of the proceeds of certain customs duties to the temple of god Narasiṁha, the goddess Lakshmi and other gods on the Anantagiri hill at Taṅgeḍa. The undated record from Sarajammanahalli mentions that the Mahāvaḍḍa-vyavahāri, the big merchant of the Ubhaya-nānādēśi and the gauḍas of Agaḷi, Maḍhuvāḍi and Nidugallanāḍu made the gift of the village of Kariyakōtanahalli as a Koḍage to Kālināyaka of Kaidāla. These examples show that the Vīra-Balañjas took active part in local administration.

SECTION: 6

THE TELIKI-1000 OF BEZAWĀḌA

The Telikis were oil-millers. They were known as Tilapiṣakas during the period of the Śātavāhanās (Luders' List, No.1137) and as Teliki-vēvuru during the medieval period. They formed themselves into a closely-knit corporate body and played an important role in the socio-economic activities even from a very early period. They became prominent during the period of the Chālukyas of Veṅgi.

In the Tēki plates of A.D.1084, the Telikis were described as Teliki-vēvuru (Teliki thousand), Bezawāḍa-śāsanulu (rulers of Bezawāḍa or natives of Bezawāḍa) and sahasra-śākhānvaya-gōtrulu (gōtrins of one thousand branches of families). Though scattered all over the country, the Telikis seem to have originally comprised one thousand branches of families and settled at Bezawāḍa. As trade increased the Telikis spread to the other places of the country. Three inscriptions from Bezawāḍa of S.1331, S.1348 and S.1475 confirm this view. While the Tēki plates describe the Telikis as Bezawāḍa-śāsanulaina-teliki-vēvuru, the Bezawāḍa records describe them as akhila-dēśāla-teliki-vēvuru (the Teliki thousand of all places). These inscriptions show the country-wide organisation of the guild of the Teliki

thousand of Bezawāḍa. They also show that the Telikis lived a corporate life, made agreements unanimously and observed social regulations uniformly for their common benefit. Thus the Telikis were a professional community and organised themselves into a guild all over the country under the common appellation of the Teliki-vēvuru.

As stated above, the Telikis were a community of sahasra-śākhānvaya-gōtrulu. The Manuvaṁśapurāṇamu,* a Telugu rendering of the Sānskrit work Khaṇḍakapālākyāna, also mentions the Telikis as a community of one thousand gōtras. Only two of these are referred to in the inscriptions. An inscription from Bāpaṭla, dated S.1076 (No. 149), records a gift made by Kētiseṭṭi, who belonged to the Musunūḍḍla gōtra. Another inscription from the same place, dated S.1076 (No. 152) records a gift made by Sūriseṭṭi, who belonged to the Velaṅdunūḍḍla gōtra. The Tēki plates, already referred to, mention ten sub-divisions of the Telikis, such as Velumanūḷḷu, Pattipāḷu, Nariyūḷḷu, Kumudāḷḷu, Marrūḷḷu, Pōvaṇḍlu, Śrāvakulu, Ūndrāḷḷu, Anumagoṇḍalu and Addanūḷḷu. These names of ten divisions and the two gōtras recorded from Bāpaṭla appear to have identical ~~expression~~ meaning, as most of them are commonly ending with "uḷḷu", plural of "ūru" meaning a village which also signifies gotras. These names may be said to have been derived from the names of places from which they hailed, such as Penugoṇḍa (present Penugoṇḍa in the West Gōdāvari district), and Pattipāḷu (present Prattipāḍu in the Guṇṭūr district) and Anumagoṇḍalu (present Anumagoṇḍa in Waraṅgal District). Similarly, the other names may also follow the same practice, but all of them may not

- -

* Dr. K.Sundaram ~~was the first to~~ refers to the Manuvaṁśapurāṇamu in his "Studies in Economic and Social conditions of Medieval Andhra", pp. 36 ff.

indicate the names of places. Some of them may refer either to the place of nativity or to the origin of the family. However, it is clear that the basis of the division of the community into branches was gōtra. Thus the gōtra became sacred to the Telikis who called themselves as a community of thousand gōtras. But their gōtras were not Ṛishi-gōtras as they were derived from the name of places. The Manuvaṁśapurāṇamu also states that the Telikis originally belonged to thousand Ṛishi-gōtras and later they took to vyavahārika-gōtras on account of the curse of sage Viśvāmbhara. Here thousand gōtras means many gōtras.

One of the lucrative professions of the period under study was that of the oil-pressing. Oil was an essential commodity of trade as it was required for burning lamps in temples, at a time when life was rigidly ordained by religious rules. Hence there was demand for these oil-millers, which consequently resulted in their prevalence all over the country, particularly, in places of religious worship. As profits increased in trade, the Telikis became conscious of their social status and adopted praśasti ~~(faith)~~ of their own in support of their claim for a higher social status. Records from Tēki of S.1006 (C.P.), Bāpaṭla of S.1076, Bezawāḍa of S.1331, and 1348, undated records from Konakanchi (No.544) and Nāḍeṇḍla (No.668) furnish many interesting details of the Teliki praśasti.

What about daily use?

SECTION: 7

GUILD OF THE TELIKI THOUSAND

Inscriptions from Krishna and Guṇṭūr districts, already referred to, record that the Teliki guild functioned as an organised corporate body in making gifts to temples. The expression,

"Bezawāḍa-śāsanulaina-teliki-vēvuru" may be viewed as the Telikis having formed themselves into a corporate body of many members at Bezawāḍa. An inscription from Nādeṇḍla (of the time of Kulōttuṅga Rājēndra Chōḍa), supports this view. This inscription records "Bezawāḍa-śāsanulaina-teliki-vēvuru-cēcina-samayamu" (the Teliki thousand of Bezawāḍa met at a convention to make a regulation). That is, the Teliki guild, which consisted of innumerable members, met at a convention on samaya-dharma to enter into an agreement. Thus the guild of the Telikis functioned as a corporate body to derive mutual benefit.

MEMBERS OF THE GUILD

The guild appeared to have had a large strength probably of one thousand. The following references are made to some of the members of the Teliki thousand of Bezawāḍa. The Tēki plates of S.1006 mention that Velañdunūlla Sūriseṭṭi was a member of the Teliki thousand of Bezawāḍa. Another inscription from Bāpaṭla of S.1076 (No.149) refers to Musunūḍla Kētiseṭṭi who was a member of the Teliki thousand of Bezawāḍa. Another inscription from Zuzzūru of S.1124 records a gift made by Kāmiseṭṭi, Amaseṭṭi, Komariseṭṭi, Braciseṭṭi(?) and Bolliseṭṭi who were members of the Teliki thousand. These examples help us to say that the members suffixed the term seṭṭi to their names as an honorific. Secondly, the Teliki guild was an association of wide territorial jurisdiction with many members.

PRIVILEGES OF THE MEMBERS

The Manuvaṁśapurāṇamu, already referred to, makes a reference to the privileges enjoyed by the members of the Teliki guild. The Purāṇamu states that king Bezawāḍa Mādhava Varma made the following

members, namely Yerrapōtamasetti of Peda-Vēngi, Pōlisetti of Nidadavōlu, Sōmisetti of Tāduvāyi, Bommisetti of Tatikalapūdi and Rāmisetti of Bezawāda as Pedda-settis or chiefs of the places (concerned) of the community. These chiefs of the community were granted certain privileges to be received at the time of social gatherings and marriage functions. Accordingly, whenever a marriage was performed the Pedda-setti of the place was to be treated respectfully by the members of the community by offering him a rōbe of honour (shawl), three mādas of coins, three bundles of betel-leaf and three hundred and sixty arecanuts. Thus the members of the guild were respected at the time of social gatherings and marriage functions, because they were the elders of the community.

UNITS OF THE GUILD

According to the Tēki plates, the Telikis were living at Vijayawāda and all other towns, cities, villages and hamlets in the country extending from the Mahēndra mountain to the Mannēr river between Ganjām and Nellōre districts. The Manuvamśapurānamu, also contains a reference to two inscriptions, which were given to the Telikis as Dharma-śāsanas by the kings, who were pleased with the conduct of the members of the Teliki community. The first inscription, of the reign of the king Bezawāda Mādhava Varma, mentions the Teliki-settis of different places like Peda-Vēngi, Nidadavōlu, Tatikalapūdi and Bezawāda. The second inscription, dated S.1190, states that king Pratāpa Chōla made a grant of villages as Ekabhōga Agrahāras to the Telikis, such as Bezawāda, Pedavēngi, Vijayarāya-Jamanāthapuri, Dhananjayapuri, Tatikalapūdi, Padmāvati, Bhōgavati, Tāduvāyi, Chintalapūdi, Gātavaram, Sākēta, Pāñchālapuravaramulu, Madhura

Ātrēyapuramu and Maṇikarṇikamu. The inscription from Bezawāḍa, dated S.1331, records a gift made by "Bezawāḍa Mallēśvaradēva-divya-śrī-pāda-padmārādhakulaina-akhiladēśāla-teliki-vēvuru". Another inscription from the same place, dated seventeen years after the first inscription in S.1348, records a gift made by "akhila-dēśāla-teliki-vēvuru". Another inscription from the same place, dated one hundred and twenty-seven years after the second record in S.1475, mentions a marriage convention entered into by "Koṇḍapalli-Koṇḍavīḍu-Rājahmahēndravaram-modalaina-akhila-dēśāla-teliki-vēvuru". These inscriptions help us to understand the unit level organisation of the guild of the Teliki thousand. In the first place, the Telikis organised the local units of the guild at several places and called themselves collectively as "akhila-dēśala-teliki-vēvuru". Secondly, the existence of several units of the guild becomes evident in the expression Koṇḍapalli-Koṇḍavīḍu-Rājahmahēndravaram (present Koṇḍapalli in Krishna district, Koṇḍavīḍu in Guṇṭūr district and Rājahmundry in East Gōdāvari district) modalaina (along with other places) akhila (all) dēśala (either centres or units at dēśa level) teliki-vēvuru (the Teliki thousand), that is, the members of the guild of the Teliki thousand from all units like Koṇḍapalli, Koṇḍavīḍu and Rājahmundry. It was a customary practice during the medieval period to divide the country into territorial divisions for administrative convenience, and as such, each division was known by the name of its chief town. The Telikis might have followed the same practice for the purpose of their guild organisation. Koṇḍapalli, Koṇḍavīḍu and Rājahmundry were three such Dēśa divisions where the Telikis organised units of the guild at that level. Therefore, Koṇḍapalli, Koṇḍavīḍu and Rājahmundry were the three units of the guild of the Teliki

thousand of Bezawāḍa. These records are important as they not only show the continuous existence of the guild organisation from the eleventh century to the sixteenth century A.D. in the country, but also establish the proof of its country-wide organisation. However, it was not known how the units were formed or functioned or their relationship with the central unit or the total strength of representatives of each unit, except a few references to them found in the inscriptions. The inscription from Zuzzūru, dated S.1124, records a gift made by five members of the Teliki thousand, who may be believed to have constituted the executive of the local unit at Zuzzūru. Nādeṇḍla was another unit which functioned in close association with the central unit at Bezawāḍa. Bāpaṭla was another such unit where a gift was kept under the care of the guild. An inscription from Mukhaliṅgam (undated-1) mentions a money gift which was kept under the care of the local unit at Chōdagaṅgapeṇṭa. The persons mentioned in the record may be said to have headed the local unit there. Two inscriptions from the same place (undated, 2 and 3) record another unit at Baṅdinigāma which was headed by the Teliki-kāmpulu. Thus the Telikis organised units of the guild at several places like Anumakoṇḍa, Baṅdinigāma, Bāpaṭla, Bezawāḍa, Chōdagaṅgapeṇṭa, Konakaṅchi, Koṇḍapalli, Koṇḍavīḍu, Mukhaliṅgam, Nādeṇḍla, Prattiāḍu, Rājahmundry, Tēki, Vēṅgi and Zuzzūru. These units constituted the Teliki thousand guild of Bezawāḍa.

SECTION: 8

FUNCTIONS OF THE GUILD:

CORPORATE LIFE

The spirit of co-operation was an essential feature of the corporate life and the Telikis exhibited this spirit to a high degree

in the sphere of social matters. They held conventions to develop their own communal life. They were governed by their own social regulations. In this connection, special mention may be made of marriage conventions entered into by the Teliki thousand in order to adopt a common and uniform pattern of life for all the members all over the country. The Tēki plates of S.1006 state that when marriages were celebrated at Vijayawāḍa and all other towns, cities, villages and hamlets in the country, the married couple were allowed to proceed on the roads on horse-back (along with their friends and relatives) and at the end of the procession, they should place a pair of valuable clothes at the feet of the king and prostrate themselves respectfully to receive from him betel served in a golden vessel. This custom might be regarded as the highest social privilege which the king could confer upon a community of devoted servants like the Telikis and they were proud of ~~observing~~ it. It may be ~~observed~~ said that the married couple by observing this custom would obtain the social and legal sanction of the society and of the government for their wedded life.

Two inscriptions from Nādeṇḍla (undated, 1 and 3), already referred to, mention that Bezawāḍa-śāsanulaina-Teliki-vēvuru-sēsina-samayamu (the Teliki thousand of Bezawāḍa made an agreement). It meant that the Teliki-vēvuru of Bezawāḍa met at a convention to set up a regulation to be followed in connection with marriage alliances. The purpose of the meeting was to establish the convention that when the wife died her jewels should go to her husband and it was a sin for his relatives (yālivāru) to claim them. The meeting of the Teliki thousand seems to have settled a dispute of property succession that might crop up between two parties by declaring its

decision in favour of the surviving husband as against the claim of the relatives of the deceased wife. Thus the Teliki guild set up the marriage convention in order to avoid similar property succession disputes among its members and thereby it cemented the bonds of communal unity of its members. Precautions taken against the violation of the convention make it clear the common desire of the community that whenever such a convention was entered into it had to be observed by all the members of all the places without fail. The guild discharged certain judicial responsibilities. The first record also refers to Srī-mahāmaṇḍalēśvara-Kulōttuṅga-Rājēndra-Cōḍa-Rājulu-kisṭa-brityunḍunu, that is, the beloved servant of the king Kulōttuṅga Rājēndra Cōḍa, who might be the king's agent in the 'giripachchima' region and representative to attend the meeting. Thus the guild not only maintained good relations with the rulers of the period but also made its conventions with the knowledge of the government.

The inscription from Bezawāḍa of S.1475 records another marriage convention (vivāha-maryāda) entered into by the akhila-dēśāla-teliki-vēvuru (the Teliki thousand of all places). The members of the guild of the Teliki thousand of all dēśās (division), such as Koṇḍavīḍu, Koṇḍapalli and Rājahmundry met at Bezawāḍa to effect the agreement that the vōli-maryāda (price to be paid to the bride at the time of fixing the marriage) for the first marriage was 21 cinna-māḍas (perhaps, no vōli-maryāda was to be observed for the second marriage), the details of which were that the bride-groom's party should pay 2 māḍas of gold and 12 māḍas of silver (as vōli) and the bride's party should pay 2 māḍas of gold (might be the gift given by the parents of the bride towards her ornaments) deducting one śasa-māḍa (peṅdli-

kūturu-vāru-bhaṅgāramu-mā-reṅdun-śāsa-māḍa-viricivēsi-mikharam-eruvai-cinna-māḍala-choppuna-naḍuchuvāramu), in all total 20 cinna-māḍas. Gold and silver in the said weights might account for the payment of vōli only as there was no reference to the payment of dowry. Thus these marriage agreements were made by the Teliki-vēvuru to extend to its members the ~~best~~ benefits of a well organised community. These examples indicate undoubtedly a highly developed sense of corporate life that existed among the members of the Teliki community of the Telugu country. ~~Hence it was exemplary in its nature. Thus an important function of the guild was to promote corporate life among the people.~~

COLLECTION OF "ARI"

Another important function of the guild of the Teliki-thousand was to collect a tax called "ari" from oil-mills. A record from Śrīkūrmam of S.1035 mentions that the Teliki-thousand exempted an oil-mill from the payment of "ari" to maintain a lamp in the temple of god Śrīkūrmanāthadēva for the merit of the Teliki community. Ari means a tax and the guild collected it from oil-mills. The record did not state whether ari was collected for the guild or for the state or both or what the rate of its annual payment was. However, the ari to be collected from one oil-mill was sufficient to maintain one perpetual lamp in the temple. At a time when the principle of tax farming was in full force and the government was ~~in the practice of~~ collecting taxes in oil-mills, the Teliki guild probably performed the duty of levying and collecting taxes on oil-mills as an agent of the government. Thus the guild probably collected taxes on oil-mills.

COLLECTIVE GIFTS

The guild of the Teliki-thousand made gifts on behalf of the community to maintain its reputation. One inscription from Śrīkūrmam of S.1035 and another from Zuzzūru of S.1124 mention the collective gifts made by the Teliki-vēvuru of Bezawāḍa, whereas two inscriptions from Bezawāḍa of S.1331 and S.1348 record similar gifts made by the Teliki-vēguru of all the dēśas. But these records do not state whether the above gifts were made from the common fund of the guild or from what source they were made. The gifts were made collectively by the guild and it is apparent that they were made from the corporate fund of the guild. Thus the guild maintained its own common fund to be utilised by its members for undertaking various corporate activities for the benefit of the community.

LAND GIFTS

The Teliki-vēvuru made gifts of land either collectively or individually. The inscription from Zuzzūru of S.1124 records the gift of some land made by the Teliki-thousand. Two records from Nāḍeṇḍla (undated, 1 and 3) refer to the gift of land made by the members of the Teliki-thousand. It is not known as to how the guild came in possession of the land, whether by means of benevolent gifts made by the members to the guild, or the guild acquired it for purposes of common use of the community or what its income was to the guild every year. It may be said that the members of the guild bought the land from its own to make the gift.

GIFT OF GOLD

The members of the Teliki-thousand made gifts of gold to temples. Two records from Bāpaṭla of S.1076 refer to the gifts of gold

(Birudamādalu-12) respectively made by Kētisetti and Sūrisetti. An inscription from Vēlpūru of S.1127 mentions that Kētisetti made the gift of 12 gōkanāka-varāha. When gold was given as gift to the god, the inference was that the gift value was to be invested on some productive purpose, or if it was a cash gift, the amount was to be deposited on a saving scheme, as the case may be, and the income derived therefrom was to be utilised for the said purpose, a responsible corporate function, similar to that of a modern banker. But the records did not state as to how the work connected with the maintenance of the gifts was carried on. Perhaps, this corporate responsibility was discharged by the guild itself, as it was the practice of the period that the guild was entrusted with the gifts made by its members.

TRUSTEESHIP

The inscription (undated 1) from Mukhalingam records that the gift of 5 mādas was kept under the care of the Teliki members of Chōdagangapenta who were mentioned by name, but not called by the common designation of the Teliki-vēvuru. Two records (undated, 2 and 3) from the same place mention the gift of land which was kept under the care of Bandinigāma-Teliki-Kāmpulu(The Telikis of Bandinigāma). The term Kāmpulu denoted cultivators, who were known by that name during the period. The Telikis of Bandinigāma followed the profession of cultivation as well as of oil-pressing. In this case, the Telikis of the place were in charge of the gifts. These records show that the Telikis were acting collectively both as donors and trustees of the gifts. They looked after the work connected with the continuation or maintenance of the gifts. The care of the land-gifts involved the responsibility of cultivating the land, raising the crop and utilising the yield thereafter for the said purpose.

TEMPLE AFFAIRS

The undated record from Konakañchi mentions that Karremasetti and Kurivisetti of the Teliki thousand community plastered the temple of Narēndrēśvara and installed the images of the gods Nārāyanadēva and Brahmadēva. They also plastered the shrines of the Parivāra-dēvatas. They made a gift of some land for service to the gods. Kurivisetti further made the gift of two lamps to the temples. Two records from Bezawāda of S.1331 and S.1348 states that the Telikis of all the dēśas constructed one Nandi-mandapa and one mukhamandapa respectively in the temple of god Mallēśvaradēva.

GIFTS TO TEMPLES

The Telikis made gifts to temples. Some of them are given below.

S.No.	Place of Inscription	Date	Gift
1.	Śrīkūrmam	S.1035	A lamp in the temple of god Śrīkūrmanāthadēva
2.	Bhōngir	S.1045 A.D.1123	The Teliki community made a gift of one oil-mill as mānya to the god Sōmēśvara of Bhuvanagiri.
3.	Anumakonda	of the time of Vikramāditya VI (A.D.1076-1126)	The Teliki-vevuru made a gift to to the god on the occasion of Uttarāyana-sankrānti.
4.	Bāpatla	S.1076	A lamp by Ketisetti in the temple at Nādendla.
5.	Bāpatla	S.1076	A lamp by Surisetti in the temple at Nādendla.

6. Rājahmundry	S.1117	A lamp by Kellisetti in the temple of Vīrabhadreśvara Mahādēva.
7. Vēlpūru	S.1127	A lamp in the temple
8. Bezawāda	S.1331	A mandapa in the temple of Mallēsvaradēva.
9. Bezawāda	S.1348	A mandapa in the temple as in No.8.
10. Nādendla	--	A lamp by Kondisetti in the temple of Chōdēśvara.
11. Nādendla	--	A lamp by Kondisetti in the temple of god Bhōyīśvara Śrīmahādēva.
12. Nādendla	--	A lamp by Kommana Godiyanalu in the temple of god Mahādēva
13. Mukhalingam	--	A lamps in the temple

-.-

TANK CONSTRUCTION

The inscription from Zuzzūru of S.1124 refers to the construction of a tank by the members of the Teliki-thousand (tamakattiṁcina-ceruvu). In this case, the guild itself undertook the work connected with the construction of the tank.

SUMMARY OF THE FUNCTIONS

In brief, the following are some of the functions of the guild of the Teliki-thousand of Bezawāda. The Telikis organised themselves in all the dēśas as a corporate body for material well-being and displayed the spirit of co-ooeration in all matters of community development. The Teliki guild made gifts of land or gold or money or sheep, as the case may be, to temples to promote the religious activity of its members. It acted as the custodian of public

property and the benefactor of public institutions. It undertook public works like the construction of a tank at Zuzzūru or maṇḍapas in the temple of god Mallēśvaradēva at Bezawāḍa. It discharged its judicial responsibilities of enquiring into, and settling of, disputes among its members without allowing them to seek the help of others in their matters and thus exhibited a sense of high social responsibility to keep up the morale of the community. It formulated social regulations on a uniform pattern of life, enforced them upon its members to create the sense of the communal unity and imposed punishments if its regulations were voilated. It inculcated among its members self-control and discipline. It declared the offenders of its conventions as hīnavādulu (mean people) or those who would incur the displeasure of their god Mallēśvara or commit the great sin of kill the cows in the Gaṅges or do the sin of killing their own eldest son or commit the five great sins. As it was a corporate organisation, the guild did not appear to have imposed either physical or corporal punishments of severe type upon the offenders of the agreements. Yet, the threat of the afore-said condemnations of the guild should have been enough on the superstitious life of its members to regulate strictly their conduct and to develop the sense of simplicity, purity and obedience. It collected taxes from the members payable to the government and thus acted as a link between the government and the people. It functioned like a bank receiving cash gifts, investing the amount on productive purpose or lending it to others on interest and utilising the income accrued thereon for the said purpose. It was held in high esteem and its co-operation was sought by others when they made gifts, as stated in the Briguband̤a record of S.1040. Sometimes, the Telikis consulted with other local

bodies and took their consent when they made gifts. An inscription from Kudatini (Bellary Dist.) of A.D. 1219, records that the sixty families of oil-makers set up the god Telligeśvara and made the gift of the cess levied on every sale and purchase of oil in the presence of the members of the five vargās of the sthāna of Koṭṭitoṇe, the ascetics of the five maṭhas, numberless gaṇās, who assembled there for the purpose. A similar activity of the Telikis was also recorded in an inscription from Tirukkachchūr, Tamilnāḍ, of the time of the Chōḷa king Rājādhirāja. It mentions that the oil-mongers of Kāñchi and its suburbs and those of 24 nagaras met at Kāñchi and decided that the oil-mongers at Tirukkachchūr should make provision for offerings and lamps in the local temple. This meeting was similar to the meetings held by the Telikis of all the deśās in the Telugu country. Thus the guild of the Teliki-thousand was urban in character, corporate in nature and professional in organisation.

SECTION: 9

CONCLUSION

We may now conclude this account of the Teliki-vēvuru of Bezawāḍa with the following observations:

1) The Telikis formed a well organised local body. It functioned at local and deśa levels. Bezawāḍa was its headquarters.
2) They had an assembly of their own. Its head was known as Peddaseṭṭi. The assembly acted as the custodian of the interests of the Telikis.
3) The guild promoted a vigorious corporate life. It entered into agreements regarding the conduct to be followed in marriages.

4) It exercised certain judicial powers and imposed rules of conduct upon its members.

5) It obtained honorary privileges from the kings of the period.

6) It made endowments to temples and undertook work of public utility.

7) It created facilities to improve the traditional profession. It also improved the economic and social conditions of its members.

SECTION: 10

THE PAÑCĀNAṂVĀRU

The term Pañcāhanaṃvāru is derived from the word pañcānana (meaning five faces). Pañcānana also means Viśvakarma. The Pañcāhanaṃvāru claimed to be the descendants of Viśvakarma. Āhana means craft. Pañcāhana means the five crafts. Thus the Pañcāhanaṃvāru were called so because they practised the five crafts of goldsmithy, blacksmithy, braziery, stone-carving and carpentry. Pañcāhanaṃ meant the guild of handicraftsmen during the period. They were known as Pañcāhanaṃvāru in Āndhra, Pañcālattar in Tamilnāḍu and Vīrapāñcālas in Karnāṭaka. Pañcalōhādhipatulu, Pañcālulu, Pañcāhanaṃvāru, Pañcānanaṃvāru, Pañcālamuvāru and Pañcālas mentioned in the Telugu records were synonymous and referred to denote collectively the five classes of the artisan community.

THEIR PRAŚASTI

They possessed their own praśasti (samasta-praśasti-sahitulaina). A Macherla record of S.1033, a Chējarla record of S.1062, a record from Amarāvati of S.1416, an undated record from Śrīkākulam and

A.R.1910 (para 60) contain a few details of the praśasti of the Pañcāhanaṃvāru. The praśasti helps us to make the following observations.

THEIR ORIGIN

They traced their lineage to Viśvakarma (Srī-Viśvakarma-vaṃśōdbhavulu). They claimed to have been the descendants of the five sons of Viśvakarma, named Manu, Maya, Tvastram, Śilpi and Viśvajña, the originators of the five crafts. Manu worked in iron, Maya in wood, Tvastram in brass, copper and alloys, Silpi in stone and Viśvajña a jeweller. Thus the Pañcāhanaṃvāru, born in the family of Viśvakarma, were divided among themselves into five sub-divisions of the artisan community.

THEIR WORSHIP OR FAITH

They were the devotees of all deities (samasta-dēvatō-nistāraka). They were worshippers of god Kamaṭēśvaradēva or god Akkasālīśvara.

THEIR QUALITIES

They claimed to have possessed many qualities. They were the principal protectors (ēkāṅgavīrulunnu), warriors of bravery (prauḍha-vīrulunnu) and of achievements (kārya-vīrulunnu). They were courageous in helping others (dhīradhīrōttaraṇa) and desirous to promote the welfare of the society (jagadhitakāraṇa). They were devoted to the cause of all people who practice purusārdhās in life (sarvajana-purusārdhyuktulaina). It may be said that the artisans attended to their duties courageously just like the soldiers. They possessed various talents. They were the men of many achievements. They were devoted to give comfort to the people. In fact their services were said to be indispensable to the society.

THEIR PROFESSION

They were experts in the profession of the five metals (pañcalōhādipatulu). They constructed the buildings in three worlds (tribhuvana-bhavana-nirmitādhāra) as well as the temples at Śrīśaila and all other places (Śrī-parvat-ālaṁkāra-anaṁta). A record from Avanāsi mentions that the architects carried out ten types of duties (daśa-kriyai). A Siṁhāchalam record of S.1309 describes a member, Dēvaranāyuḍu as nityaṁprasūna-srajaṁ-śrī-mīnānvya-bhūmi-pāla-bhavanālaṁkāra-kārāgraṇiṁ".

THEIR LEARNING

They attained profound knowledge in the Sabda-sāstra and the Purāṇas (śabda-śāstra-purāṇa-pārāvāra-gaṁbhīra). They possessed keen and penetrating skill in understanding all aspects of the Vāstu-śāstra and the iconography for the purpose of constructing buildings and preparing images of deities. They gained proficiency in handling the implements of their profession.

THEIR ĀCHĀRYAS

The Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru suffixed the title Āchārya to their names as an honorific. Āchārya, Āchāri, Ōju or Ōjha (vikriti of upādhyāya) were synonymous and used to denote the same title. Āchārya means a teacher. This honorific was appropriate as the Āchārya taught at his place the students of the community the crafts in which he was considered an expert and a master. Jalapēśvarapuram was one of the centres of their learning.

The Mācherla record of S.1033 mentions that Viśvakarma, the son of Brahma, was the progenitor of the architects and was the father-in-law of the sun. Viśvakarma converted the rays proceeding

from the sun into divine weapons, like the discus of Vishnu. Āchāryas of his family are said to be the experts in cutting liṅgās (of Śiva), in preparing images, in building mansions, in grasping the geometry(kshētra) and in using all kinds of implements. A record from Ayyaṅgāripālem (undated 2) states that Chāmōjha was a pupil of Kalagarābharaṇāchārya, who was an ornament of the Viśvakarma-kula and Āchārya of Jalapēśvarapuram. Another inscription from the same place (undated 1) records that Kalagarābharaṇāchārya was a master architect. The record from Amarāvati of S.1416 states that the Āchāryas were the embodiment of knowledge in different sciences. Thus the Āchāryas were ~~the~~ eminent architects as well as teachers in the five crafts. They were most probably the heads of the community.

THEIR CASTE

As stated above, the Pañcāhanaṁvāru described themselves as having been born in the family of Viśvakarma (Viśvakarma-vaṁśōdbhavulu). The record from Ayyaṅgāripālem (undated 1) mentions that the great architect Kalagarābharaṇāchārya was born in the fourth caste. A record from Jambukēśavaram (Tamilnāḍu) and another from Chandragiri refer to the five classes of artisans as Añju-Jātiyār. It may be said that the Pañcāhanaṁvāru became so prominent in the society during the period that they began to claim a divine origin to their community by tracing mythical descent from Viśvakarma, occupied a privileged position in society and evolved into an endogamous sub-sect of the fourth caste. In fact, " the industrial groups of rathakāra and veṇa had formed real caste groups (jāti)."

THEIR QUARTERS

Usually, they lived in the precincts of the temples. Sometimes, they lived in a separate quarter. A Kistnapatnam undated record mentions the street of the artisans in the town of Kistnapatnam (Añjuvannattārteru). An epigraph from Bōdan of A.D.1056 refers to the street of the artisans to the north of the temple.

THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS

They built the temples for the worship of the gods and they were rewarded with the land gifts. A record from Valivēru of S.1026 mentions the gift of some land to the mason (kāse), who built the temple of Svayaṁbhudēva. A Gaṇapavaram record of the time of the king Kulōttuṅga Rājēndra Chōḍa records that the people granted the gift of land to a temple builder, Kamōju. The Mācherla record of S.1033 refers to the gift of land to the architects (Silpikāchāryas), Tippōju and Navōju, who built the temple of Adityēśvara. Another record from the same place of S.1035 also refers to the construction of a nagastaṁbha pillar in the same temple by the same architects. A record from Eḍavalli of S.1179 registers the gift of land to the masons, Kamōju, Gaṅgōju, Gōpōju and Anamōju, who built the maṇḍapa of the temple of god Svayaṁbhudēva. A record (undated 1) from Udayagiri refers to the construction of a tower (gōpura), a hall (maṇḍapa), compound walls (prakārālu) and a reservoir (kōnēru) in the temple of god Raghunāyakulu by the Pañcāhanaṁvāru. Another record from Ayyaṅgāripālem (undated 1) mentions that the architect Kalagarābharaṇāchārya built the temple of Jalapēśa.

Some of them distinguished themselves as brave warriors in the army. A Chēbrōlu* record of the 12th century mentions that Sūrana,

---

*Dr.K.Sundaram (1968, p.28) was the first to refer to the general Sūrana.

a member of the Viśvakarma-kula, served a local chief Erramanda as a general of the army. The king conferred on him various insignia of royalty.

They made thrones to the kings. A record from Gaunivāripalli of S.1303 states that the Pañcālas made the throne, hajārasiṁhāsana to the king Harihara I.

THEIR PRIVILEGES

They obtained exemptions from taxes. They appeared to have enjoyed this privilege owing to their devoted service to the gods, kings and the people (diśāvalayam-nandu-sunka-parivargitulunnu). In case, the local officers attempted to impose taxes upon them, they not only resisted to pay them but also preferred to leave the place protesting against the official infringement of their privileges. A Kanagānipalle record of S.1455 records that Iśvarayya, the agent of Timmappa Nāyanivāru, issued an order to the Reḍḍi, Karnam and other village officers at Kanagānipalle to remit the taxes on the Pañcāḷamuvāru of the place from which they had been exempt since former times. When taxes were imposed in the time of Timmappa Nāiḍu, the Pañcāḷamuvāru migrated to Kundripi-sīma and Pākalā-sīma.

Gifts of land were made in appreciation of their services. An epigraph from Bokkallu of A.D.1176 mentions that a certain Mallireḍḍi made a gift of land yielding two crops free from all taxes to a stone mason, Gundōju.

They were specially honoured at the time of car-festivals. The record from Udayagiri (undated 1) mentions that Timmarāju established a convention among the people to be observed in respect of the Pañcāhaṇamvāru in future festivals, which states:"When the

deity in the car passes through the holy streets, when the dancing girls and servants are inside the car, a member of the Pañcāhanaṃvāru wearing a head cloth, wrapping a cloth loosely round the waist, and having only a sandal mark between the eye brows and not chewing betel, should go round, in front of the car, with a chisel, a mallet, a nail and a sickle in his hands". A Nellōre record of S.1495 records that Veṅkaṭappa Nāidu made the arrangement that the Pañcāhanaṃvāru were to be respected at the time of car-festival days of god Pallikoṇḍanāthadēva at Nellōre, in the same way as at Tirupati(?). The sthala-karnams, kāpus, settis and Pāka Reddis (Reddis of Pākanāḍu) agreed to observe this etiquette. The Pañcālas in Karnāṭaka also enjoyed certain privileges at the time of car-festivals in Vidyānagara and at Bēlūr.

Kings granted several privileges to them. The Gauniwāripalli record of S.1303 refers to certain privileges granted to the Pañcālas by Harihara I in presence of Bhikshāvritti Tātayya, the Arudariśanas and the 18 samayas. A record from Bāṅgalōre of A.D. 1306 also mentions that Ballala III granted the privileges to the Pañcālas in Karnāṭaka. Thus the Pañcāhanaṃvāru were entitled to have several honours in Āndhra and Karnāṭaka.

THEIR CITY*

They called themselves as lords of the town of Peṅdoṭa (Peṅdoṭapuravarādhīśvara). It may be noted that their city, which was the centre of their activities, and their deity at Dharaṇikōṭa are in the Guṇṭūr district. The earliest epigraph of this community, which belongs to the 7th century A.D., is also from Ayyaṅgāripālem

---

* Sri M.S.Sarma ~~and Dr.K.Sundaram were~~ was the first to refer to the city of Peṅdōṭa.

(undated 1) of this district. It may be observed that the artisans who gained professional importance spread to other places of the country from this region. A record from Mysore of A.D.1372 mentions that the Pañcālas in Karnāṭaka claimed to be the lords of Peṅḍōṭa, adorners of Śrīparvata and worshippers of the feet of the god Kamaṭēśvara. These epithets figured prominently in the Amarāvati record of S.1416. Some kind of liaison among the artisans of the two countries would have been existed even before the 14th century.

SECTION: 11

THE GUILD OF THE PANCAHANAMVARU

It is evident from the following expressions, such as the Pañcāhaṇamvāru of (all) dēśās, the Pañcāhanaṃvāru of the 14 copalas (places?) between the hills of Koṇḍapalli and Bezawāḍa, the Pañcāhanaṃvāru of Naṭavāḍi and Srīraṅgarājukoṇḍa-sīma, the Pañcāhanaṃvāru of the kingdom of Udayagiri and of 74 ahaṇās and the Sanasta-Pañcāṇulu that the Pañcāhaṇaṃvāru formed themselves into a corporate body, who became prominent during the medieval period and played a vital role in the life of the country.

ORGANISATION OF THE GUILD

A Pālakōl undated record mentions that the Pañcāhaṇaṃvāru of (all) dēśas granted an exemption to a certain Surāśari from pannu-kūḍu (professional tax). This record shows that the artisans of all places had an assembly which met in the precinct of the temple of god Srīrāmaliṅgēśvara to attend to the business of the community. Another undated record from Srīkākulam states that the Pañcāhaṇaṃvāru (diśāvalayamnandu-suṅka-parivargitulaina-pañcalōhādhipatulu) granted an exemption to one person (name missing) from taxes. It is evident

that the Pañcāhanaṁvāru assembled together at a place for the said purpose. Thus these records show that the artisans had their own corporate organisation. The assembly acted as the custodian of the interests of the members of the community. Pālakōl and Śrīkākulam were two of its centres.

An inscription from Śrīkūrmam of the time of Bhānudēva refers to the organisation of samasta-pañcādis (all artisans). A record from Siṁhāchalam of S.1228 also mentions the organisation of all artisans. The record states that (samasta-pañcādulu) all artisans entered into an agreement with the state officers in connection with the administration of the temple. Siṁhāchalam and Śrīkūrmam were other centres of the assembly of the artisans. The members of the assembly were known as Agasāle-Nāyakallu or Kaṁsāli-Nāyakulu as mentioned in a record of Srīkūrmam of S.1271.

Sometimes, the assembly represented the artisans of a territorial division. The record from Amarāvati of S.1416 refers to the Pañcāhanaṁvāru of the 14 tapalas (padunālugu-tapala-pañcāhanaṁvāru) of the region between the hills of Koṇḍapalli and Bezawāḍa. In this case, the organisation of the artisans was spread over the 14 tapalas (not specified) between Koṇḍapalli (a place of political importance) and Bezawāḍa (a place of religious worship). Dharaṇikōṭa was its headquarters. Another undated record from the same place mentions the Pañcāhanaṁvāru of Nandigāma and other places in Nānttavāḍi (Natavāḍi) and Srīrangarājukoṇḍa-sīma. In this example, the artisans of two divisions were included in the organisation. Nandigāma, Amarāvati and Srīrangarājukoṇḍa were also the centres of the organisation. These records show that the Pañcāhanaṁvāru of Nandigāma in Natavāḍi in one

side, Srīrangarāju-konda-sīma (in Guntūr district) on the other and the 14 tapala region between the hills of Kondapalli and Bezawāda with Dharanikōta and Amarāvati as chief centres, appear to have had a representative organisation. It looks like a regional assembly of the artisans. Mahāpātra (minister) Mallaya, who was acting on their behalf in the records, was most probably the state officer at Dharanikōta.

There was an example of a rājya level organisation also. According to a record from Udayagiri (undated 2), the organisation comprised the Pañcāhanamvāru of Udayagiri, Nellōre, Koratūr, Gandavaram Duvvūr, Ātukūr, Jaladañki, Kodavalūr, Allūr, Kōvūr, Vovvēru, Prabhākarapatnam, Krishnarāyapatnam, Sariyapalli, Rāpūr, Kandukūr, Podili, Kanigiri, Kegipa and other villages in the kingdom (rājya) of Udayagiri and of 74 ahanās. Ahana denotes a division. 74 ahanās denoted the 74 divisions into which the artisan community was divided in the country on territorial basis. The 74 divisions were most probably the same as the dēśālu mentioned in the Pālakōl record. It is evident that the artisans had a representative assembly functioning at different units, each consisting of a few villages and towns. The organisation of the Pañcāhanamvāru of 74 ahanās or (all) dēśālu in the Telugu country resembles the assembly of the Rathakārās in Tamilnādu and the Samasta-Pañcālas in Karnātaka. A record from Alangudi states that the Rathakārās assembled in full in the temple of god Perumāl at Rājarāja Chaturvēdimangalam in order to attend to the samaya-kārya. The decision of the assembly was binding on all the Rathakārās of several districts (nādus). A record from Bāngalōre of A.D.1300 mentions that the Samasta-Pañcālas assembled together

without a vacancy in the temple of god Sikkopperumāḷ to enter into an agreement. These examples help us to say that the Pañcāhaṇamvāru who were living in villages, towns, sīma, dēśa or rājya formed themselves into an influential local body of the Telugu country, in the same way as in contemporary Tamilnāḍu and Karṇāṭaka.

SECTION: 12

FUNCTIONS OF THE GUILD

They were devoted to the cause of public service. They helped the kings and the people by constructing all kinds of buildings and supplying all types of requirements in day to day life. They undertook various types of work in the temples. The record from Gaṇapavaram states that the village assembly patronised a mason. Usually, they were employed in the temples on hereditary basis, as mentioned in the undated record of Pālakōl and of Nādeṇḍla (undated,4). Another record (undated, 5) from Nādeṇḍla mentions that a part of the temple land was assigned to the masons. The Valivēru record of S.1026 states that a mason was employed in the temple of Svayambhūdēva to do repairs to the temple from time to time. A record from Bhīmavaram of S.1099 refers to the gift of some land and house-site to a mason for working in the temple of Bhīmēśvara.

They were donors as well as trustees of the gifts. A Nellōre epigraph (undated, 2) records that two goldsmiths, with the promise to continue the charity in future, made a gift of one māḍa to maintain two evening lamps to the god Akkasālīśvara. It was stipulated that the māḍa was to be lent out on interest but other particulars were not known as they are missing in the record. However, the interest to be collected on the māḍa is believed to have been

sufficient for maintaining two lamps in the temple. The undated inscription from Gaṇapavaram refers to the gift to the temple Chandraprabha-Jinālaya by Akkasāla Kāmōju for the welfare of the people and for the merit of Kulōttunga-Rājēndra-Chōḍa.

They played their own role in the promotion of the village administration. A record from Nāgulapāḍu of S.1225 mentions that the Pañcāhanaṃvāru who figured as one among the 18 samayas took part in the village activities. The record from Boggaram of S.1323 states that the artisans were associated with the Nānādēśi to make provision for the worship of the goddess Gur̤rāla-Paramēśvari. A record from Pañchadhārla of S.1359 refers to the sale of some land by the Pañcāḷulu and Nāyilu (cultivators) to one Buddasāni. It meant that the common land was under the control of the village assembly, which was composed of the Pañcāḷulu and Nāyilu of the place. A record from Peddakallēpalli mentions that the Pañcāhanaṃvāru and the Ballijas made an agreement with regard to marriage processions and took an oath to observe the agreement in future before the god Nāgēśvara.

They took part in the administration of the temple. A record from Siṁhāchalam of S.1228 mentions that all the Pañcādulu joined with the state officers at Siṁhāchalam to take a decision concerning 150 malla-mādas deposited with Tirupati Śrīvaishnavulu. The Pālakōl undated record refers to an agreement made between the Pañcāhanaṃvāru and the temple Pūjāris. The latter agreed to pay onee in a day on all days (in a week) one mānika (measure) and one sōla (1/4 of mānika) of rice for the merit of the Pañcāhanaṃvāru to Kāśa Surāsari, who should attend to all types of works in the temple.

The Pañcāhanaṃvāru collected taxes from the members of the community. The inscription from Udayagiri (undated 2) records that

the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru of the kingdom of Udayagiri remitted to the treasury of the god Raghunāyakulu at Udayagiri the taxes they collected from the members. The record from Boggaram of S.1323 mentions that the artisans paid contributions to the goddess Guṟṟāla-paramēśvari.

They granted exemption to their members from taxes. The Pālakōl undated record states that a certain Kāśa Surāsari was exempted from the payment of Pannu-kūḍu (a kind of professional tax) by the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru. Another undated record from Śrīkākulam registers that they granted a similar exemption to a person from the payment of Bōgara-pannu (a tax) and other taxes. These examples show that the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru had a voice in the collection of taxes payable to the state.

They also obtained exemptions from taxes from the government. The Kanagānipalle record of S.1455 mentions that the Pañcālamuvāru were exempted from several taxes by the State officer, Isvarayya. An inscription from Koṇḍapalli of S.1457 refers to the remission of the tax called aṇḍiśata-suṅkam by the king at the request of the sthala-karṇam of the district and the people in favour of the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru.

Regarding matters of common interest, they bargained collectively with the officers of the government. According to the record from Amarāvati of S.1416, the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru of Koṇḍapalli, Bezawāḍa and the 14 tapala surrounding places obtained a dharmaśāsana from Mallaya Mahāpatra, who on their behalf granted taxes (pannu and paḷya-pannu) payable to the government by the pañcāhaṇaṁvāru of Dharaṇikōṭa and Amarāvati as the gift to the god Kamaṭēśvara at Dharaṇikōṭa.

They settled their wages by mutual agreement. An inscription from Kamalāpuram of S.1471 and other from Chidipirāla of S.1475 record that the goldsmiths of Kamalāpuram and Chidipirāla arrived at an agreement to distribute amongst themselves their rights and incomes (kānachis and ōjarikas) of eleven specified villages.

The association of the Pañcāhanaṃvāru was powerful enough to maintain strict discipline among its members. The assembly made agreements in the presence of the deity so that the members might observe them without fail. The offenders of the agreements were punished. Inscriptions from Amarāvati, already referred to, state that whoever destroyed the grants or disobeyed the agreements of the assembly was declared to have committed the sin of gō-hatya or Brahma-hatya or killed his own parents or his eldest son or incurred the displeasure of their god and their guild. According to a Nellōre record of S.1495, the offenders would be deemed to have incurred the sin of killing cows, Brāhmins and newly born infants near Gānges. (There are about 52 records referring to the Pañcāhanaṃvāru, majority of them belong to the Pre-Vijayanagara period and a few to the later period. The records of the former give few details whereas those of the latter furnish many details. Hence the records of the later period are cited for elucidation).

SECTION: 13

CONCLUSION

The following observations emerge from our study of the Pañcāhanaṃvāru based on epigraphic evidence:

1) The united five castes of the artisans were collectively known as the Pañcāhanaṃvāru in the Telugu country. They

belonged to the Viśvakarma-kula. They called themselves as lords of Peṇḍōṭa and worshippers of the god Kamaṭēśvara.

2) Kamalāpuram, Kiṣṭnapaṭnam, Māchеrla, Nādeṇḍla, Nellōre, Pālakōl, Siṁhāchalam, Śrīkūrmam, Śrikākulam, Śrīśailam, Tirupati and Udayagiri were some of the centres of the association of the Pañcāhaṇaṁvāru.

3) They formed themselves into an association. It was a craft guild. Its members were known as Agasāle-Nāyakulu or Kaṁsāli-Nāyakulu.

4) They had a representative assembly which met in the mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple to transact the samaya-kārya of the community. The decisions of the assembly were binding on all members. The offenders of the agreements were punished. The assembly acted as the custodian of the interests of the community.

5) It was a territorial assembly comprising 74 ahaṇās under its jurisdiction. It functioned at the village, sīma, dēśa or rājya levels.

6) The assembly had powers to impose a tax or appoint a spokesman to act on behest of the assembly.

7) The artisans obtained several privileges from the kings and the subordinate rulers.

8) They maintained good relations with the kings, the local authorities and the people.

9) They entered into agreements, made collective gifts and were associated with other local bodies on matters of common importance.

10) As a part of the village population which was ordinarily divided into the 18 castes or communities, they took part in village administration.

CHAPTER VII

THE MAHĀNĀḌU

SECTION: 1

THE MAHĀNĀḌU

There are inscriptions referring to an organisation called the mahānāḍu. It appears to have been the largest local assembly. While it was known as mahānāḍu in medieval Karnāṭaka and Āndhra, it was called Periyanāḍu in Tamilnāḍu.

Three types of assemblies are described in this chapter. In the first place, assemblies called mahānāḍu are dealt with. Secondly, assemblies which resembled mahānāḍu ~~are elucidated.~~ and thirdly, composite assemblies of nāḍus are ~~exemplified.~~ treated

The following are a few examples of the meetings of the assemblies which were called mahānāḍu.

1) An inscription from Polasa of A.D. 1108 mentions that the protectors of the Vīra-Balañja-Dharma consisting of Ayyāvoḷe Five hundred Svāmis, Mummuridaṇḍas of thirty-six bīḍu and the Samasta-ubhaya-nānādēśi assembled as mahānāḍu (mahānāḍāgiruddu) at Polasa. (details about these guilds are given under the Guild Assemblies).

2) An epigraph from Alampūr of A.D. 1182 records that the representatives of the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvoḷe, Pramukha-ubhaya-nānādēśi, Mummuridaṇḍas of thirty six bīḍu, Kamnaḍa-4000 (members of this district) and the chief men of the sthalas like Tumbula, Gobbūru, Madūra and Alampūr assembled as mahānāḍu (mahānāḍāgineradu) at Alampūr.

3) A record from Chintapalle of A.D. 1240 states that the commercial bodies such as the Ubhaya-nānādēśi, Gavares and

Mummuridandas assembled as a mahānādu for making a gift to the temple of Mūlasthāna-Mallikārjuna at Gudimetta.

4) An inscription from Nadigallu of A.D. 1245 refers to Periyanādu, which was the same as mahānādu. Its head was known as vishayattār.

There were some big assemblies which resembled mahānādu but were not called by that name. A few such examples are mentioned below.

1) A record from Basinikonda of A.D. 1050 mentions that the Five hundred of the thousand of the four quarters including nādu, nagara and nānādēśi met together at Sīrāvalli. In this example, the assembly did not confine itself to a particular place, but it spread over a fairly vast region.

2) An inscription from Pedda Kadumūru of the 3rd regnal year of Kalachūri Ahavamalladēva states that the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvole, the Mummuridandas of the thirty six bīdu and the Ubhaya-nānādēśi of Kamnada-4000 (the native and foreign merchants of this district) assembled together at Pedda Kadumūru.

3) An epigraph from Warangal of A.D. 1228 refers to a meeting of Dēśi (an assembly of local merchants), Swadēśi (an assembly of native merchants), Paradēśi-bēhārulu (an assembly of merchants coming from outside countries), Ubhaya-nānadēśi (an assembly of both kinds of native and foreign merchants), the inhabitants of the Vādas (localities of the place) the asesha-nakharamu, the samasta-nakharamu (explained under the towns) and the merchants trading in vegetables (kūrakāyala-bēhārulu), greens (ākulu) and oil (nūne-bēhārulu). In this case, the members of the meeting were the merchants of

different guilds, who were engaged in the trade of various articles at Warangal.

4) An epigraph from Kistnapatam of A.D. 1279 mentions the meeting of the merchants of the nadus, towns, hills, and the five mandalam and all the five hundred foreigners from all the 18 countries, who assembled together at Tirukkavanam.

5) A record from Nellore of A.D. 1564 refers to the meeting of official and non-official members, who included Kamchannam garu, the local adhikari (officer), the people and the nanadesis.

These examples indicate that the members of the mahanadu and similar large assemblies (which for the sake of convenience we call mahanadu) included the heads of merchant-guilds, of the people of the region where the meetings were held and the officers of the government of the place.

They point out that the constituent units of the mahanadu were mostly the merchant guilds of different territorial jurisdictions. Each guild was the largest assembly by itself in the area it represented.

They also help us to say that the largest local assemblies were the same as mahanadu. It may be said that the mahanadu was dominated by the members of the merchant guilds. It was less political and more mercantile in character. Just like the district assemblies of the Gupta times*, which were dominated by the

---

* The śreshthi of the Gupta times was probably the same as the setti in Andhra, who was an influential and a rich merchant in the town. Nagara-śreshthin was probably equal to Nagaraswami or Pattanaswami, the head of the town merchants. He represented the merchant guild in the administration of the town. Sarthavaha may be identified with the leader of the itinerant merchants known as Vaddavyavahari. Samaya-chakravarti, the head of the mercantile congregation, was probably equal in status to prathama-kulika or prathama-kayasta. The latter may have been identical with the sthala-karanam or or desai-karanam.

Nagaraśrēshthi, Sārthavāha, Prathamakulika and Prathamakāyastha, the district assemblies in medieval Āndhra were headed by the merchant leaders such as Samaya-Chakravarti, Heggade and Prithvīsetti.

From being a mercantile organisation, the mahānādu evolved itself into an association of caste guild. An undated epigraph from Pālagiri refers to the mahānādu of Balijasettis. The Balijasettis, who assembled as a mahānādu, made a gift of taxes on marriage among Balijasettis to the temple of Bhīmēśvara. This assembly was akin to the mahānādu of the Thulava Vellālar community in Karnātaka, whose assembly and its elected leader were both known as mahānādu (QJMS, 11, p. 62).

SECTION: 2

OTHER LARGER ASSEMBLIES

Inscriptions refer to some composite assemblies of nādus. Just as groups of villages formed into nādus for getting benefits of integration, groups of nādus joined together and formed themselves into associations of nādus. They were named after the number of nādus in them. Thus, for example, if there were four nādus in one assembly, it was known as four nādus. This practice also prevailed in medieval Karnātaka and some of the examples were four nādus or nālku-nādu, ten-nādus or padinādu and fourteen nādus or padinālku-nādu.

The following are a few similar examples from the Telugu country.

1) Two epigraphs from Alampūr of A.D.1056 and A.D. 1076 refer to the assembly of four nādus (nālku-nādu). Another one from the same place of A.D. 1073 mentions that the nālku-nādu consisted of

Kanne-300, Podakallemtu-100, Naravādi-500 and Ayaze-300, which were its four constituents.

2) An inscription from Sangameśvaram of A.D.1173 records a gift of land made by the assembly of four nādus (nālku-nādu-mahānādu), eight nādus (the twelve of the entu-nādu) and other corporations such as the Five hundred Svāmis of Ayyāvole, the settis of Kannada-4000, Yadadore-2000, the Mummuridandas and the Ubhaya-nānādēśi settis. In this case, the assembly of the nālku-nādu was called the mahānādu. Thus the composite assembly of nādus was also known as the mahānādu.

There are also references to some big assemblies which referred to the meetings of the people. They may be called the regional assemblies of the inhabitants. A few examples are given below:

1. An epigraph from Nellōre of A.D.1197 mentions that the inhabitants of several nādus (named) of Jayankonda-chōla-mandalam assembled together to make a gift of land to the Vishnu temple. It was one of the biggest assemblies of the people.

2. An inscription from Ganapēśvaram of A.D.1231 records that the inhabitants of the 18 Vishayas on both sides of the river Krishna gave a fanam on every boat touching Nangegadda to the temple of Ganapateśvara at Divi. It was one of the largest regional assemblies of all the people.

3. A record from Mallam of the reign of Nandipottaraśar states that the members of the meeting were the men of the district, the villagers and the heads of assemblies.

These examples help us to state that the largest local assemblies were the same as the mahānāḍu.

SECTION: 3

VENUE OF THE MAHĀNĀḌU AND OTHER LARGER ASSEMBLIES

The meetings of the mahānāḍu were held in capitals of either nāḍu or sthala. They were also held in places of religious worship and business centres. Alampūr, Basinikoṇḍa, Chintapalle, Gaṇapēśvaramu, Kistnapaṭam, Nellōre, Pālagiri, Pedakaḍumūru, Polasa, Sangamēśvaram and Warangal were some of the centres of the largest meetings. The mahānāḍu was held at the time of fairs or festivals either in a temple, garden or in a mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple. A Nellōre record of A.D.1197 and two records from Kistnapaṭam of A.D. 1256 and A.D. 1279 mention both the flower garden and the mukhamaṇḍapa of the temple, where meetings took place. Festivals or religious celebrations in temples took place annually; as such, the mahānāḍu may be regarded as an annual meeting of different trade guilds.

There were rules for the smooth conduct of meetings. The members of the guilds, who came to attend the mahānāḍu, were expected to sit in a position of vajrāsana on the dias before the meeting began. A record from Pedda Kaḍumūru, as mentioned above, refers to the preparation of the meeting as ". . . . . ubhaya-nānādēśiyum-kūḍi-Hiriya Kaḍam-būralu-tōraṇavam-kaṭṭi-simhāsanārūḍ-harāgi-kuḷḷiddu", that is, the members of the meeting built a portal and sat on the dias to attend to the business of the meeting. Another record from Koṇḍavīḍu of S.1445 mentions that "Koṇḍavīti-Nāgavaramma-gāri-mukhamaṇḍapāna-vajrasimhāsanārūḍhulai-sabha-gūrcunna-yābhaiyāru-dēśamulavāru", that is, the members of the 56 countries, who assembled

together in the mukhamandapa of the temple of the goddess Nāgavaramma at Kondavīdu, sat in a vajrāsana position on the dias. The expression "vajrasimhāsanārudhulai" might mean either sitting in a vajrāsana position or sitting on a diamond throne. It may be taken to mean sitting in a position of vajrāsana on a dias, otherwise called vajrasimhāsanam. Hence, it refers to the importance of the meeting. Perhaps, it was the approved method of sitting while conducting the meetings. This shows the discipline of the members at the meeting. This proceedure was similar to vajra-baisanige, meaning vajrāsana followed at meetings of guilds in contemporary Karnātaka.

SECTION: 4

PRESIDENT OF THE MAHANADU

As mahānādu was a composite assembly of local corporations, it should have functioned under a central authority. An undated record from Bādanehālu mentions that a certain Ereyama-Nāyaka was the heggade of mahānādu. Heggade meant head. In this case, Ereyama-Nāyaka was the president of mahānādu. While heggade was the head of mahānādu in Āndhra, Samaya-chakravarti, was the president of mahānādu in contemporary Karnātaka. G.S. Dikshit (1964, p.31) refers to a certain Jayapati-setti as the Samaya-chakravarti of the mahānādu of Hirisingi for eighteen years. There are also other examples. An inscription from Simhāchalam of S.1026 records that a certain Cirukūri Appanarāma was the Samaya-chakravarti of the guild of the foreign merchants coming from 18 countries (padunenimidi-bhūmi-samaya). An epigraph from Alampūr of S.1221 mentions that Mummadi Brahmisetti was the head of Balañja-samaya of Alampūr-sthala-samasta-pekkamdru and he bore the title of Prithvīsetti. Prithvīsetti, probably, acted

as the president of mahānādu at Alampūr. Thus, the president of mahānādu was known by different appellations at different places.

SECTION: 5

FUNCTIONS

The corporate character of the largest assemblies is indicated in the following expressions:

1. "We, all the townsmen of (Kollaturai) and the foreigners of the eighteen countries, gave the above (gift of money), agreeing to continue as long as the moon and the sun last" (NDI, 1, G.39).

2. "We, all the merchants from the nādus, towns, hills and five maṇḍalams and all the foreigners from all the eighteen countries, gave this one-fourth per cent to be paid to this deity as long as the moon and the sun last" (NDI, 1, G. 45).

TAXES

The mahānāḍu collected taxes from its members on various transactions. The record from Alampūr of A.D.1056 refers to the gift of income from several taxes collected from the four-nāḍus for a perpetual lamp and offerings in the temple of Brahmēśvara. Another one from the same place of A.D.1182 mentions a gift of income derived from several taxes for service and maintenance of a perpetual lamp in the temple of Gavarēśvara.

Sometimes, it collected taxes at ports, ferries and markets for the maintenance of temples. A few examples are given below.

1. The record from Gaṇapēśvaram of A.D. 1231 mentions the gift of a large fanam (chinna) on every boat touching at Naṅgegaḍḍa to the temple of Gaṇapatēśavara at Divi.

2. The inscription from Kistnapatam of A.D. 1279 records the gift of one-fourth per cent on the appraised cost of all the bags exported and imported at the port of Kistnapatam for expenses connected with building, sacred food and ornaments for the god Manumasiddhēśvara. This record provides an example of self-government in trade as the merchants agreed among themselves to pay the above mentioned contribution to the temple.

3. The epigraph from Nellōre of A.D.1364 refers to the fees collected in the market for service in the temple of Irukulā Paramēśvari.

GIFTS TO TEMPLES

The *mahānādu* made gifts to temples. The following are a few examples.

1. The record from Alampūr of A.D.1076 records the gift made to the temple of Brahmēśvara.

2. The record from Polasa of A.D.1108 refers to the gift made to the temple of Pulastyēśvara.

3. An inscription from Boggaram of S.1323 mentions the gift of the village Boggaram to the goddess Gurrāla Paramēśvari by the trading chiefs of several communities including the *Nānādesis*. In this case, the inference is that the income derived from the village was alienated in favour of the temple.

There are examples of land and money gifts made to temples.

1. The record from Saṅgamēśvaram of A.D.1173 mentions the gift of land for the worship of god Saṅgamēśvara and for the feeding and clothing of the *Sthānapati* Tatpurusha-*pandita*.

2. The epigraph from Nellōre of A.D. 1197 records the gift of 2200 *kuli* of land to the temple at *Chitramēlivinnagar*.

3. The record from Mallam, mentioned earlier, ~~states~~ mentions a gift of 35 kalanji of gold for maintaining lamps to the god Subrahmanya.

RULES OF CONDUCT

The mahānādu had the right to issue rules of conduct for the welfare of the mercantile community. The record from Pedda Kadumūru, already referred to, mentions that the merchants from several trading corporations assembled together at Pedda Kadumūru in the presence of their right hand people (Hiriya-makkalu) and their left hand people (Jagatimakkalu). They promulgated the social regulation to be observed by their left hand people (tamma-Jagatimakkalige-kotta-śāsana-vamtamdade) that whenever social gatherings or marriage celebrations took place they should stand left in front of the tōrana to chew betel (tōrana-dalu-mumche-tambulamum-cheyudu-gare-yedavakkadalira-hāruya). Whichever of the two parties (ubhayavaru-dolage-subha-sōbhana-valadēdhichchinna-vibhēda-mādidavaru) violated this agreement should pay a fine of 12,000 honna (coins) or 12 khandugas(puttis) of land and 12 khandugas of oil. Whoever refuses to pay this fine should be regarded as a traitor. It may be inferred that the mahānādu made social regulations, enforced them upon its members and punished those who disobeyed its agreements. It enjoyed a sort of judicial authority.

TO DEVELOP TOWNS

The general assembly of the merchants took keen interest in developing towns for the promotion of trade. The record from Basinikonda of A.D. 1050, as stated above, mentions a mercantile convention, which resolved to convert the village Sīravalli into a

Nānādēśiya-Daśamadi-Erivīrapaṭṭana (market-centre to accommodate the merchants coming from nāḍu, nagara and nānādēśi). It also granted certain privileges to the residents of the place. It may be inferred that the mahānāḍu developed towns, supervised the markets, improved the conditions of trade and provided equal opportunities to the merchants of all places. It created vīrapaṭṭanas (places of privilege in trade) to the merchants and provided the people with civic amenities. Thus it enjoyed economic freedom in commercial and allied matters in the region to which it confined its activities.

SUMMARY OF THE FUNCTIONS

The mahānāḍu appears to have functioned occasionally. It brought different local corporations under its organisation and created common understanding among merchants in order probably to avoid unhealthy competition in trade. It enjoyed economic freedom either in fixing prices of goods or collecting taxes on business transactions of its members. It promoted the spirit of co-operation between native and foreign merchants of nāḍu, nagara and nānādēśis. It not only preserved self-government in trade but also developed towns for the benefit of trade. But it did not neglect the corporate life among the merchants. Gifts made by the mahānāḍu show its keen interest in matters of collective responsibility and its desire to undertake the care of public works. It endowed gifts to temples, which were centres of trade and seats of cultural activities. The maintenance of the temple meant, apart from promoting the religious zeal of the people, promotion of trade and commerce.

SECTION; 6

CONCLUSION

This account on the *mahānāḍu* may be concluded with a few observations.

1. The biggest local assemblies were known as the *mahānāḍu*. Dr. G.S. Dikshit (1964, p.29) says that the *mahānāḍu* was the district assembly, while Sri K.V. Subrahmanya Aiyar (*QJMS*, Vol. XLV) calls it the largest provincial organisation. The *mahānāḍu* was a composite assembly of different local corporations in pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra.

2. The *mahānāḍu* met occasionally. Merchants took initiative in holding its meetings. Thus, its leadership remained with them.

3. Information relating to its area, membership and headship is meagre. It does not appear to have had its own establishment.

4. Its functions were few. Usually it was an assembly of merchant guilds. As such, its functions generally were confined to the interests of the merchants.

5. Though it was a regional assembly, it had no responsibility for the administration of the region. However, it performed some of the functions of the local bodies.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Before closing this account of the local bodies in ~~the~~ pre-Vijayanagara Āndhra, a few results of this inquiry may be indicated.

1. An important characteristic feature of the local bodies during the period under survey is that they present a great variety in their organisation, structure and functions. The local assemblies were of two types, namely, the territorial assemblies and the guild assemblies. The territorial assemblies included the Village, the Nādu or Sthala and the Mahānādu. While the Village Assembly was confined to the people of the village, the Nādu and the Mahānādu related to the groups of villages or even bigger territorial organisations. The guild assemblies included both merchant guilds and craft guilds. The town assembly belonged to the local merchants. In fact, the towns were the centres of numerous guild organisations. The craft guilds, such as the Teliki-1000, the artisans and the cultivators, as we have seen, were some of the bigger associations extending over wide areas. Thus there were innumerable associations both territorial and professional.

2. The local assemblies were autonomous bodies. While the villages included in them one or more hamlets, the towns had their puras (extensions) or pētas (wards), which had their own headmen and assemblies. The nādu also had its own head and assembly, which was composed of the representatives of the villages forming the nādu. These local bodies acquired, maintained ~~the~~ and utilised in the common

interest corporate property in land and money, undertook the collective responsibility of looking after the gifts made to public institutions, agreed to give contributions and made gifts to temples and other charitable institutions, collected and remitted taxes, discharged certain judicial responsibilities of settling disputes of the members, enforced a code of conduct and safeguarded the interests and privileges of the members. In short, they regulated, supervised and controlled the economic, social and religious activities of the people. The high degree of autonomy enjoyed by these bodies may be inferred from the rigid regulations, such as expelling offenders of the agreements from the samaya, which they had enforced upon the members. They even exercised the right of imposing the extreme punishment of death on traitors to the guild who interfered with its rights and privileges.

3. They were representative bodies and hence popular in character. The village assembly as well as the nāḍu assembly in in the nāḍu, were formed by the representatives of the people. The expressions such as the ūrināyakulu (leaders of the village) or the principal residents (heads of the people) indicate that the heads of the assemblies represented the people.

4. They functioned in a democratic manner. They took decisions collectively. This collective action of the assemblies may be inferred from the manner in which the meetings were held and decisions taken. The use of such expressions as neraṁgganu (in the presence of), oḍaṁbaḍasi (made them ~~to~~ agree), samasta-janulu-kūḍi-cēsina dharmamu (all the people, who assembled together, agreed to make the gift), istimi (we gifted) and anmatamuna (with the consent of) shows that

the decisions taken by the assemblies were unanimous. Their spirit of co-operation with regard to the common matters was admirable.

5. They contributed to the welfare of the people. While the town assembly called the *nagara* performed various municipal functions in towns, the bigger assemblies, extending over wide areas, like the *nāḍu* and the *mahānāḍu* devoted themselves to the betterment of the region under their jurisdiction. The town and village assemblies enriched the civic amenities of the people. They looked after the maintenance of temples, tanks, wells, water-sheds, gardens, feeding-houses, etc. They functioned like a bank receiving deposits and paying interest on the same for the conduct of public works. They also performed the duties of a trustee of the public property.

6. The local bodies realised the value of integration. Just as the spirit of co-operation among the people was responsible for the formation of villages, the same spirit led the villages to form *nāḍus*. Similarly, groups of *nāḍus* formed associations of *nāḍus*. These associations were formed for realising the benefits of group organisation. As Dr.G.S.Dikshit aptly remarks (Local, p.36) "Nothing proves the vitality of the people as much as the free and voluntary association of villages into *nāḍus* and the association of *nāḍus* into bigger bodies".

7. The same spirit of co-operation resulted in the formation of professional groups such as those of the merchants and craftsmen. It may be pointed out that they claimed equal status with the upper classes by inventing a mythical origin from the Celestial Beings and by obtaining honorary privileges from the kings. They

adopted *praśastis* of their own to establish the divine origin of the community and enhance their social status, perhaps, an attempt to have a privileged position, similar to that of the Brāhmin community. This was due to the changing social standards of the people, who began to develop a new out-look of life due to material advancement. Each community associated itself with a town and worshipped a particular diety, following the examples of communities higher in social status according to tradition. They also followed hereditary occupations and assumed the character of castes. Dr. Lallanji Gopal observes (*JIH*, 1965, pp. 771 f) that the hereditary occupations of these groups made the life of the guilds permanent and led to their becoming closed and fixed bodies with their own rules.

8. The difference between the guild assemblies and the territorial assemblies may be indicated here. Both were self-governing institutions of the period. Both were formed with common aims and objectives, but they were not alike in organisation. The guild assemblies were professional associations. The membership in the assembly was restricted to the members of the same profession or community. The territorial assemblies were the general assemblies. They represented either one place or several places. Sometimes the jurisdiction of these assemblies covered wide areas. They were also the bigger assemblies. The membership of the assembly was open to all the communities or the representatives of the region. Both kinds of assemblies met frequently and performed numerous functions. While the former looked after the interests of the professional groups, the latter promoted the welfare of the people. The guild assemblies had no responsibility of administration of the region,

whereas the territorial assemblies were concerned with the administration of the region, because they were composed of the representatives of the people.

9. The local bodies acted as agents of the government. They collected and remitted the taxes payable to the government by their members. Thus they were the connecting link between the government and the people.

APPENDIX-I

THE NAKARAMU OF PENUGONDA

SECTION: 1

INTRODUCTORY

The Kōmatis* were merchants, grocers and moneylenders. They constituted the principal trading community and played an important role in the socio-economic activities of the period. They organised themselves into a corporate body for their material well being. They called themselves Vaiśyas, meaning merchants and Nakaras meaning worshippers of god Nakarēśvara.

THEIR PRAŚASTI

As they were economically rich, they wanted to hold a privileged position in society. They adopted a praśasti, in which they described themselves as natives of Penugonda and traced their lineage to Kubēra. Records from Nādendla of S.1046, Prattipādu of S.1089 and Ahōbalam of S.1531 record several details of the praśasti of the Kōmati community.

THEIR GŌTRAS

They claimed to possess 102 gōtras. The Vaiśyapurāṇamu (5:43) (L.R. 21, p.202) states that the Vaiśya community originally consisted of 714 gōtras (8:25), of them 102 were considered as the pure gōtras of the community (8: 182)**. Inscriptions (see references under the Vaiśya gōtras) from Guntūr, Krishna and Gōdāvari districts of the

---

* An inscription from Drākshārāma of S.990 appears to contained the earliest reference to the Kōmatis. It is not known how the term Kōmati originated. Castes, III, pp.306 ff; Bharati, April, 1955; Rājarājanarēndra pattābhishēka Sancika, p.145.

** Srīnātha mentions thousand gōtras (Haravilāsam, p.74); also Heming way's District Gazetteer of Godavari, p.54; L.R; 21, p.202.

period refer to the Vaiśya merchants, who belonged to the gōtras of Mokkōl, Nābela, Dhanadakula, Maddikula, Pentikula, penddikula, Sūlikoli, Murukōla, Śirasetla, Śirakula, Yelisetti, Mūlya, Yanukōla, Chennuse-śetti, Puchchakōla, Yeraśetti, Bodarakula, Vivarisitla, Venukola, Appanangakula; Pendlikula, Pendikula, Sūrakola, Utakula, Baligāra, Śrōtrīya, Penagōsila and Punumgōsa.

A critical study of the Vaiśya gōtras reveals the fact that they were not derived from the names of ancient sages, but from the totem of either plants, animals or Celestial places. However, there are references to a few gōtras, which were derived from the names of sages.* In an inscription from Jinigirāvandlapalli of S.1345, a Vaiśya merchant is stated to have belonged to the Kānva-Rishi-gōtra. It also records that Agastya was purōhita and Garuda was the banner of a certain Siriyāla-śetti.

THEIR SUB-DIVISIONS

The Kōmatis were divided among themselves into sub-divisions. According to the Vaiśyapurānamu, already referred to, they were divided into two divisions, namely Vēgina and Bēri. The Vēgina-Kōmatis were those who entered the fire-pits with Vāsavīkanyakā. They were also known as Gaura-Kōmatis, because they maintained the social prestige of the community. The Bēri-Kōmatis were those who did not enter the fire-pits with Vāsavikanyakā. The term Bēri is said to be a corruption of bedari (fright). It is also said to be a corruption of Kubēra. Another division of them may be said to have formed on a territorial basis. In an inscription from Drākshārāma of S.990, a merchant is described as Kamma-Kōmati. An epigraph from Bāpatla of S.1071 and

---

* Srīnātha in his Haravilāsamu traced the lineage of Avaci Tippaya-setti to the sage Mankana (Mankana-maunivamśa-manimandana) (K. Sundaram, 1968, p.57).

another one from Elūru of S.1123 make reference to Kamma-Vaiśya. The term Kamma may denote the name of the place from which the above merchants hailed. Thus, the term Kamma means the Kammanāḍu. As it was the practice of the time to divide the country into territorial divisions for administrative convenience, the Kōmaṭis appear to have followed the same practice for the identification of the locality in which they lived. Moreover, Kammanāḍu was another division, next to Penugoṇḍa, where the Kōmaṭis lived in a flourishing state. Similarly, Kaḷiṅga-Kōmaṭis were those who hailed from the Kaḷiṅga country.

THEIR QUARTERS

It may be noted that the Kōmaṭis lived together in separate quarters. An inscription from Tripurāntakam of S.1174, states that the Kōmaṭis resided in the northern part of the village (uttarāna-Kōmaṭi-iṇḍlu). A record from Pākāla of A.D.1320 mentions Kōmaṭis as 'nagaramulōnivāru'. These examples establish the fact that the Kōmaṭis followed the practice of settling themselves in a particular part of the town. An inscription from Mukhaliṅgamu of S.1063 makes a reference to Nakarapuvāḍa. It may be said that where the members of the Nakaramu settled and carried on their business transactions, the place came to be known as Nakarapuvāda. Nakaramu meant town or part of a town. The practice of different functional groups living in separate streets of towns or villages was coming from the early period and the Vāstu-śāstra made this system of town planning quite popular among the people. The contents of the Vaiśyapurāṇamu (5:15) are supposed to represent the events of the Eastern Chāḷukya times. They mention the town planning of the city of Penugoṇḍa and say that the western part

of the city was fixed for the residence of the Brāhmins, the eastern part for the Kshatriyas, the central part of the city for the Vaiśyas and the northern and southern parts for the Sūdra communities.

SECTION: 2

NAKARAMU OF PENUGOṆḌA

It appears that the term Nakaramu was used for both local and central organisation. Dr.N.Venkataramanayya (1950, p.285) remarks that "the Nakarams of all the eighteen towns were incorporated into a federation with its headquarters at Penugoṇḍa".

Dr. R. Narasimha Rao (Corporate, p.33) gives the following explanations as to how the name of Nakaramu, Nakharamu or Nagaramu came into use. (1) It is the name of a weapon carried and used by the guild army and the guild was named after the weapon, probably shaped like the Nakha. Hence the name of Nakharamu. (2) The Nakaramu is the same as Akaramu, meaning tax free. The Nakaramu was called so because its members were exempted from the payment of some taxes to the state. (3) According to the Vaisyapurāṇamu (V. 36; VII : 6), the strongholds of the Nagaramu, eighteen in number, were given to the Nagarulu as Agrahāras by the Lord Almighty, whom the Nagaras worshipped in the form of Nagarēśvara. (4) The Nakaramu was the contracted form of Penugoṇḍa-Nagaramu.

SECTION: 3

NUMERICAL SUFFIX OF THE NAKARAMU

The number (Nakaramu-nūṭa-yibbaṁdru) affixed to the Nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa helps us to understand the country-wide organisation of

the Vaiśya guild. It refers to the strength and the Nakaramu consisted of 102 members. But, it is not known how many members were taken from each of the eighteen towns. However, the strength of the town guild, recorded in an inscription from Viśakhapatnam, may be taken to serve as an example. This inscription records a gift made by the Nakaramu-12 of Viśākhapatnam. That is, the merchants of Viśākhapatnam formed themselves into a guild, called Nakaramu with a strength of twelve members. If a town Nakaramu is to have a strength of twelve members, there is reason to believe that the Nakaramu of Penugonda, the federation of eighteen towns, could have a strength of 102 members. An inscription from Ahōbalam, dated S.1531, confirms the view-point that the numerical figure refers to the membership of the Nakaramu. It records that the guild of merchants, who were called devotees of Vāsavīkanyakā, made a gift to the god for the merit of 150 headmen (Nagaraswāmins). It states that they had increased in numbers and influence by the blessings of the holy Bhāskarāchārya, that they were the chiefs of Penugonda, and that they were devoted to the principles of mercantile business. It may be noted that the Nakaramu of Penugonda consisted of 102 members when the Ghantasāla record was made in S.1066. The membership continued to be 102 even in S.1448 as recorded in an inscription from Undavalli. Its membership was subsequently increased to 150 by the time of the Ahōbalamu record, which was made in S.1531. But, it is not known on what basis the membership was increased from 102 to 150 and how the members were drawn from the community. However, the members were called Nagaraswāmins or headmen of the Vaiśya community

and the lords of Penugoṇḍa as they were called in the other records, already mentioned. Thus, the number refers to the heads of the guild, ~~who belonged to 102 gōtras.~~

SECTION: 4

MEMBERS OF THE NAKARAMU

The expression, Penugoṇḍa-puravarādhīśvara, helps us to draw the inference that the holder of this appellation was a member of the Nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa. Inscriptions refer to the following members of the Nakaramu. An inscription from Nādeṇḍla of S.1046 records that Gōmahaseṭṭi was a lord of Penugoṇḍa. In an epigraph from Ghaṇṭasāla of S.1066, Kommana is described as the lord of Penugoṇḍa (Penugoṇḍa-śāsanuḍu). Another inscription from the same place of S.1066 also describes Kōṭa Kommiseṭṭi as Penugoṇḍaśāsanuḍu (lord of Penugoṇḍa). A record from Rājahmuṇḍry of S.1067 mentions a gift made by Prōliseṭṭi, a lord of Penugoṇḍa. An inscription from Prattipāḍu of S.1089 describes a merchant called Nārāyana as lord of Penugoṇḍa. An epigraph from Yenamalakuduru of S.1152 describes Nīliseṭṭi as the lord of Penugoṇḍa. An inscription from Bezawāḍa of S.1163 states that Paruvala Malliseṭṭi was a lord of Penugoṇḍa. An epigraph from Yenamadala of S.1310 records a gift made by Koṇḍamallu, who was a worshipper of god Nagarēśvara, a Penugoṇḍapuravarādhīśvara and a member of the Vaiśya community. An inscription from Guṇṭūr of S.1310 mentions a gift made by Gaṅgiseṭṭi, who was a worshipper of Nagarēśvara, a Penugoṇḍapuravarādhīśvara and a member of the Vaiśya community. According to the Vaiśyapurāṇamu, the members were known as Nagarasvāmulu (7 : 108). They were also called Nakaras.

QUALITIES OF MEMBERS

The members of the Nakaramu claimed to possess many good qualities. The inscription from Nādendla of S.1046 refers to Gōmanasetti, who belonged to the family, famous for giving charities. He was not only rich but also possessed name and fame. He was the foremost in the mokkōla family and head of Penugonda (mōkkōla-kulōttamundu-Penugonda-Vibhundu-Prabhundu) and spoke the truth (satyavākśīlundu). The inscription from Rājahmundry of S.1067 mentions that Prōlisetti of Penugonda was the head of the Vaiśyas. He was sharp and clever (patumati). He was the embodiment of philanthropy (kulanidhi-dāna-ākarah). He possessed good qualities such as honesty, modesty and humility (nayavinaya-nidhi). He was a man of sober disposition (śāntah) and like a moon (chandra) in promoting the cause of his community. He was the head of those who worshipped Śiva and was a man of spotless reputation. A record from Bāpatla of S.1071 states that Konnisetti was proficient in trade and head of the community. He was an expert in examining all types of commodities in the market (samasta-vastu-vistāra-tatwālōka). He was a man of purity, truth and honesty (satya-chauchāchāra). He possessed perseverence in modesty, submissiveness and kindness (naya-vinaya-dāna-gunālamkrita). He worshipped the feet of the Gods and Brāhmins (dēva-brāhmana-pādārādhita). He was in the habit of giving food to those in need (āsrita-jana-santtarpanatriptī). He received the blessings of many groups of the learned Brāhmins (anēka-dvija-ganāśīrvāda). He was respected not only by the people but also by the rulers (rājamānamāni). He held the status of the head of the prominent settis, whose guild spread all over the country

(dharma-pattanādhistāyaka-himavatsētupariyanta-śrēsta-setti-ganādhīśa-pratipatti). An epigraph from Karakantapuram of A.D.1164 registers the fact that Ereyamasetti was Mahāvaddavyavahāri (great merchant), the chief of the Vaiśyas and a Mahēśvara. The inscription from Prattipādu of S.1089 records that Nārāyana was the head of the settis of Penugonda, head of those who promoted dharma. He was rich in reputation (agranī-śrēsti-vargānāmagranī-dharma-karmminām-penugonda purēśa-nāmagranī-yaśasāgāgranīm). The members of his family were good, obedient and learned in Sruti and Vēda. Thus, the head of the Nakaramu was a man of sober disposition, spotless character and good reputation. He was wellversed in the art of trade and philanthropic activities. The epigraph from Yenamalakuduru of S.1152 refers to Nīlisetti who was a Penugondapuravarādhīśvara and Āryasetti (head or one who was respected by all). An inscription from Bezawāda of S.1165 records that Paruva Anni setti was a lord of Penugonda (Penugondaśāsanundu) and practised in life dharmārdhakāma-mōksha. He used to help his relations (bandhunidānundunu). He worshipped gods, Brāhmins and gurus (dēva-dvija-guru-sēvakundunu). He was a man of reputation (vikyātakīrtiyu) and true follower of dharma (dharma-niratundunu). He was the best in the Penddikula family.

It may be noted that the qualities recorded in the above inscriptions were required to be possessed by those who became the heads or members of the Nakaramu of Penugonda. They were stated to have been the best in the family to which they belonged and they possessed the abilities of leadership. It may also be said that the Nakaramu was both a communal and commercial organisation for the

advancement of trade and commerce. It was urban in character, philanthropic in nature and corporate in organisation.

SECTION: 5

UNITS OF THE NAKARAM

The Nakaramu was composed of eighteen units, which were organised in eighteen towns. Penugoṇḍa Nakaramu was the central organisation, while the other seventeen were affiliated to it. According to the Vaiśyapurāṇamu (5:36), the constituent units of the Nakaramu were Dharma, Dhanada, Pāñcāla, Nirāvadhya, Jagannādha, Kshīrakāsāra, Deṅdulūru, Ela, Ghaṇṭasāla, Triguṇita, Ghanabhīma, Viśāla, Kaḷiṅga, Nrusiṁha, Vīranārāyana, Ācaṇṭa, Nagaramu and Penugoṇḍa. The members of the Nakaramu were stated to have been well acquainted with the towns and cities of Veṅgidēśa (Veṅgidēśa-grāma-mahāgiripura-prakasita-buddhi-grāmanulu) (6:1). Dēśa means a territorial division. Veṅgidēśa may means the territorial division with its headquarters at Veṅgi. This statement of the Purāṇa helps us to understand that the above mentioned places were situated in the territory of Veṅgi, the extent of which during this period included the modern districts of Viśākhapaṭṭnamu, East and West Gōdāvari, Krishna and a part of Guṇṭūr. Moreover, many inscriptions of the Vaiśyas, with the appellation Penugoṇḍapuravarādhīśvara, are found in the Gōdāvari, Krishna and Guṇṭūr districts. Therefore, the eighteen places mentioned in the Purāṇamu may be located in this region. It may be noted that some of the above mentioned places continued to exist for a long time as centres of commercial and cultural importance, such as Penugoṇḍa, present Penugoṇḍa in the

West Gōdāvari district (2) Dhandapura, Tsandavōle in the Guntūr district (3) Nirāvadhya, Nidadavōlu in the West Gōdāvari district (4) Jagannādha, Drākshārāmamu in the East Gōdāvari district (5) Kshīrakāsāra, Pālakōl in the West Gōdāvari district (6) Dendulūru, the same place in the West Gōdāvari district (7) Ela, Elūru in the West Gōdāvari district (8) Ghantasāla, the same place in the Krishna district (9) Ghanabhīma, present Bhīmavaram in the East Gōdāvari district (10) Viśākha, present Viśākhapatnam (11) Kalinga, present Kalingapatnam (12) Acanta, the same place in the West Gōdāvari district and (13) Nagaramu, the same place in the East Gōdāvari district. ~~Though~~ Some of these places at present are small and cannot claim the status of a modern township, most of them are situated in the region between the rivers, Krishna and Gōdāvari. It may be said that the Vaiśyas first settled in this region and subsequently spread to other places. The other towns cannot be identified. They might be situated in the region between the Krishna and the Gōdāvari.

SECTION: 6

VENUE OF THE NAKARAMU

The meetings of the Nakaramu were held at Penugonda in the mukhamandapa of the Nakarēśvara temple (8:12). Invitations were sent to all the Nagara-swāmulu (7: 108). They were properly seated (7: 111). Those who did not attend the meeting were expelled (LG, p.117). Final decisions were taken by consensus. Secret agents were employed to communicate the decisions of the central assembly. The assembly usually transacted business of commercial interest in general and of communal matters in particular. The Vaiśyapurānamu

gives an example of the meeting held at Penugonda. It was a meeting of a Dharmasabhā which was held to take decision on a samaya-dharma in connection with a marriage alliance (1:14). It was presided over by Kausumasetti, president of the Nakaramu, and attended by the caste-guru, Bhāskarāchārya. The members were invited from all the units. There was a regular procedure as to how to convene a meeting and invite its members. It was the work of the Samayamantri to make all arrangements for the smooth conduct of the meeting (7:108). The decision taken in the meeting was final and binding upon all the members. Those who disobeyed the decisions were severely punished or excommunicated from the community. It may be noted that such members, who were excommunicated from the community, could be brought back into the fold of the community, if ~~such a member~~ he performed the prāyascitta (purification) ceremony under the guidance of the caste-Guru (Corporate, p.47).

SECTION: 7

HEAD OF THE NAKARAMU

The head of the Nakaramu was Mahimasetti.* An inscription from Karakantapuram, already referred to, dated A.D. 1164, states that Erayama setti, a Vaiśya merchant, was Mahāvaddavyavahāri (Chief merchant).

The head of the Nakaramu had many duties to discharge and privileges to enjoy. His main duty was to maintain the dharma of the Nakaramu. In an inscription from Bāpatla, already referred to,

* Vaiśyapurānamu, 8:47, corporate, p.44; LG, P.117; As the secretary of the Nakāramu was called Samaya-mantri, the president of the Nakaramu was probably the Samaya-chakravarti. Mahimasetti, Prithvīsetti, Mahāvaddavyavahari and Samaya-chakravarti were synonymous.

Kannisetti was stated to have been known for establishing the dharma (Dharma-pattanādhistāyaka). Another inscription from Prattipādu, as stated above, refers to Nārāyana (also Kommisetti) who was the head of those who promoted dharma (dharma-karminām-Penugonda-Purīsā-nāmagrānī-yaśasāgranīm). It may be said that the main function of the president was to define and interpret the dharma concerning the Nakaramu. Another function was to give charities to the poor and conduct several philanthropic activities for the merit of the community. As stated above, the record from Bāpatla states that Kannisetti was enjoying the respect not only from the people but also from the rulers (rājamānamāni). That is, the Chief merchant enjoyed a respectable position among the members of the Nakaramu. He may be said to have acted as a banker to the kings and thus he was the connecting link between the government on one hand and the Nakaramu on the other. But we do not know which were the other functions. He enjoyed the privilege of receiving the betel from the members of the community (LG, p.117).

SECTION: 8

FUNCTIONS OF THE NAKARAMU:

COLLECTION OF TOLLS

The Nakaramu collected tolls on business transactions. An inscription from Chennupalli of S.1073 refers to the grant of a village to the temple of Sōmīśvaradēva by Kosanayasetti. In this case, the inference was that the revenue of the village derived from the collection of tolls was granted to the temple. An epigraph from Karakantapuram of A.D. 1164 mentions that the Nakaras granted a

portion of the toll-revenue to the god Brahmēśvaradēva. Though it was not stated whether the tolls were collected for the state or the Nakaramu or both, the Nakaras collected tolls on every sale and purchase of goods, probably on behalf of the guild as agents of the state. Thus the Nakaras were the farmers of tolls.

TO PROTECT THE GIFTS

The Nakaramu supervised the operation of gifts. Two records from Ghaṇṭasāla of S.1066 and S.1142 refer to the gifts kept under the care of Nakaramu-102. The second one records that Mārisetṭi entrusted 25 cows and one breeding bull to an individual (Paruvana Bōyana) for maintaining a perpetual lamp in the temple of god Jaladhīśvara by supplying every day one māna (measure) of ghee. The gift was placed under the care of the Nakaramu-102. In this case, the gift was handed over to the trustee (named) and the assembly of the Nakaramu was asked to supervise the gift. The supervision of the gifts implied the duty of conducting the gifts regularly as per the stipulations laid down by the donors. In performing this work, the Nakaramu gave an assurance of safety of the gift-property and encouragement to its members to undertake philanthropic works, a corporate responsibility, the aim of which was to develop the spirit of co-operation, good-will and unity among its members.

TEMPLE CONSTRUCTION

The Nakaras built temples. The inscription from Nādeṇḍla of S.1046 mentions that Gōmanasetṭi of Penugoṇḍa built the temple of Viśvēśvara at Nādeṇḍla. The record from Chennupalli of S.1073 refers

to the construction of the temple of Sōmēśvaradēva by Kosanayyasetti. An epigraph from Edavalli of S.1079 states that Pōtisetti built the temple of Svayambhu-Brahmēśvara at Edavalli. The inscription from Karakantapuram of S.1086 records that Ereyama setti, the Vaiśya chief, built the temple of Śiva at Peda Tumbalam. The Undavalli record of S.1448 registers that Mallisetti and Krishnamasetti built the temple of Bhāskarēśvara at Undavalli. These examples show the religious zeal of the members of the Nakaramu.

GIFTS TO TEMPLES

Inscriptions of the merchants, who called themselves as lords of Penugonda, record gifts either in cash or in kind, made by them to temples individually or collectively. Some of them are given below.

S.No.	Place	Date	Gifts
1.	Drākshārāma	S. 990	Lamp in the temple of Bhīmēśvaradēva by Papayasetti.
2.	Drākshārāma	S.1060	Lamp by Prōlisetti to the above temple.
3.	Ghantasāla (No.114)	S.1066	Two lamps in the temple of Jaladhīśvara by Kommana.
4.	Ghantasāla (No.115)	S.1066	Two lamps by Kommisetti in the temple as in No.3.
5.	Rājahmundry	S.1067	Lamp in the temple of Vīrabhadrēśvara by Prōlisetti at Pattisam.

6. Drākshārāma	S.1070	Lamp by Pōtiseṭṭi in the temple as in No.1
7. Bāpaṭla	S.1071	Lamp in the temple of Bhāvanārayana by Kanniseṭṭi.
8. Drākshārāma	S.1072	Lamp by Kommiseṭṭi in the temple as in No.1.
9. Mādala	S.1073	Lamp in the temple of gods Sakalēś-vara and Kēśavadēva at Māvunḍla.
10. Eḍavalli	S.1079	Lamp in the temple of Gaṇḍēśvara by Nārāyana.
11. Prattipāḍu	S.1089	Lamp in the temple as in No.10
12. Rājahmuṇḍry	S.1117	Lamp in the temple of Vīrabhadrēś-vara by Kelliseṭṭi.
13. Ēlūru	S.1123	Lamp in the temple of Krishna by Yāytamaseṭṭi
14. Drākshārāma	S.1142	Lamp by Mariseṭṭi as in No.1.
15. Bezawāḍa	S.1163	Lamp in the temple of Mallēśvara by Malliseṭṭi.
16. Koṇḍanāyanivaram	S.1165	Lamp in the temple of Kēśavadēva by Anniseṭṭi.
17. Mañḍadam	S.1201	Lamp in the temple of Rāmēśvara by Amariseṭṭi.
18. Pākāla	S.1242	Lamp in the temple of Rāmayadēva by the Kōmaṭis of Nellōre.
19. Yanamadala	S.1310	A pillar and a lamp in the temple of Mailāradēva by Koṇḍamallu.

20. Guṇṭūr	S.1310	A pillar and a lamp by Gaṅgiseṭṭi in the temple of Mailāradēva.
21. Guṇṭūr (No. 85 of 1917)	S.1326	A pillar in the temple of Nagarēśvara at Koṇḍapalli by Vēmpalliseṭṭi.
22. Guṇṭūr (No. 84 of 1917)	S.1326	A pillar by Sakaḷayaseṭṭi as in No. 21
23. Koṇḍavīḍu (No.447 of 1916)	S.1326	A pillar for the mukhamaṇḍapa of the Nakarēśvara temple at Koṇḍavīḍu by Narahariseṭṭi.
24. Koṇḍavīḍu (No.448 of 1916)	S.1326	A pillar by Suggiseṭṭi as in No.23
25. Yanamadala	S.1327	A pillar for the Āsthāna maṇḍapa of the temple of Rāghavēśvara.
26. Gaṇapavaram	..	A pillar by Kanniseṭṭi
27. Zūpūḍi	..	A pillar by two Paṭ̂anasvāmins, Sarabhirāju and Appayya.

These records as well as the others mentioned above help us to make a few observations. (1) The above mentioned places might have been the centres of the organisation of the Nakaramu. (2) They refer to the donors. They were lords of Penugoṇḍa and worshippers of the god Nakarēśvara. These members of the Nakaramu undertook works of public utility. (3) They also refer to the donees. The gifts were made to temples, which were the centres of cultural activities. (4) They refer to the donations too. The construction of temples, tanks, wells, gardens or gifts of lamps involved regular expenditure connected with their maintenance. The gift-amount is

believed to have been received, atleast in some cases, from the common fund. This view is confirmed by the Uṇḍavalli record. It states that the donors of the gift were the lords of Penugoṇḍa and they made the gift for the merit of the Nakaramu-102. Similarly the gift recorded in the Ahōbalam epigraph was also made for the merit of 150 Nagarasvāmins. Thus, the Nakaramu maintained its own common fund for the purpose of philanthropic activities. Its members undertook the public works like the construction of temples, tanks and gardens for the common benefit of the people, who were their patrons and whose good will was the basis for their flourishing economic condition.

TANKS, GARDENS AND WELLS

The Chennupalli record of S.1073 refers to the construction of a tank on the western side of Kōṭyadona by Kosanayyaseṭṭi. An epigraph from Jinigirāvaṇḍlapalli of Ś.1345 refers to the gift of the construction of a tank by Tippiseṭṭi. The Uṇḍavalli record states that the temple was endowed with a garden and a tank. An inscription from Vaṅgīpuram registers that Balliseṭṭi, Malliseṭṭi, Nāriseṭṭi and Atiseṭṭi constructed a tank. These examples show the interest evinced in undertaking the public works by the members of the Nakaramu.

LEARNING

The Bāpaṭla record of S.1071 states that Kanniseṭṭi obtained the blessings of many learned Brāhmins by patronising them. The Prattipāḍu epigraph of S.1089 mentions that Nārāyana and his family members were learned in Sruti and Vēda. A Vaṅkāyalapāḍu

record of S.1693 (a record of later period cited for information) records that Krishnamasetti patronised a poet, Narasā-pandita. Thus the members of the Nakaramu promoted learning and cultural activities.

SAMAYA-DHARMA

An idea of the Samaya-dharma of the Nakaramu of Penugonda can be had from the Vaisyapurānamu (7:114). It appears that the Samaya-dharma included the decisions taken at the meetings of the Samaya-sabhā. Samaya-mantri was in charge of the Samaya-dharma. For example, when king Vishnuvardhana of Rājahmundry wanted to marry Vāsavī, daughter of Kusumasetti, the latter sought the permission of the Samaya-sabhā. The assembly after a careful deliberation of all the pros and cons of the issue, decided to preserve the social custom of the community, called mēnarikam or kulāchāra-dharmamu (8:30, p.117) and denied its permission for the marriage. This shows that the Nakaramu regulated rules of conduct or kattadi of its own upon all the members in order to preserve the communal unity. It was the responsibility of the Samaya-mantri. Thus, the Nakaramu enjoyed the exclusive right to define and interpret the Samaya-dharma (rules of conduct) or vartaka-dharma (mercantile business).

SECTION: 9

THE AUTHENTICITY OF VAIŚYAPURĀNAMU:

The contents of the Vaiśyapurānamu

The Vaiśyapurānamu states that the Vaiśyas of 714 gōtras were living in eighteen towns built by Viśvakarma in the region of

Gōdāvari (5:36). Vishnuvardhana, son of Vijayārka and a Chālukya king of Rājahmundry, while going on a digvijaya (tour), halted ~~to stop~~ at Penugonda, a self-governing town. The Vaiśyas of the place honoured him very much. The king happened to see Vāsavī, daughter of Kusumasetti, the chief-setti of Penugonda. The king at once developed passion for her beauty and requested Kusumasetti to give his daughter in marriage to him (7:59) (Kusumāhvaya-nīputtrika-nasadrisalāvanya-nāku-nati-vēdukatō-nosagumu-māmā-yanagā-vasudhāsthali-velayu-vaiśya-vamśādhīsā"). But Kusumasetti could not agree immediately for the marriage and sought the approval of the Nakaramu. As already stated, the Samaya-mantri made arrangements to convene the general body meeting (Samaya-sabhā) of all Nagaraswāmins to take decision on the issue (7 : 108). The outcome of the meeting was that Kusumasetti was not permitted to prefer an inter-caste marriage (8:11). This decision ultimately led to the self-immolation of Vāsavī and the elders of the 102 gōtras (8:182-196). Thence forward Vāsavī became the tutelary goddess of the community and came to be worshipped as Vāsavī-Kanyakā-Paramēśvari. The 102 gōtras came to be regarded as the pure gōtras of the community.

Epigraphic evidence

The story given in the Vaiśyapurānamu is corroborated by epigraphic evidence. An inscription built into the prakāra of the Nakarēśvara temple at Penugonda, undated, records that Penugonda was one of the eighteen towns built by Viśvakarma and presented to

the Vaiśyas as a place of residence by Śiva. The epigraph from Ghaṇṭasāla of S.1066 makes a reference to the Nakaramu-102 i.e., the Vaiśya merchants of the 102 gōtras. This is the earliest known dated record which mentions the 102 gōtras of the Vaiśya community. It may be said that the story of Vāsavī as recorded in the Vaiśyapurāṇamu took place before the date of this record, i.e., A.D. 1144 and in all probability this event took place during the Eastern Chālukya period. Another record from the same place of S.1142 records a gift placed under the care of the Nakaramu-102, that is, the Vaiśya merchants of the 102 gōtras. This record confirms the fact that the story of Vāsavī became popular in the country by 13th century A.D. The inscription from Ahōbalam of S.1531 further supports the story of Vāsavī by making a reference to the guild of merchants who were devotees of Vāsavīkanyakā, followers of Guru Bhāskarāchārya, the progeny of the Celestial Cow born from its ears and the lords of Penugoṇḍa.

The Kōmaṭi community at present

A study of the present religious set up of the Kōmaṭis, such as their worship of Vāsavīkanyakāparamēśvari, their absolute belief in the sanctity of the Vaiśyapurāṇamu and their determination not to have a temple for their goddess at Rājahmuṇḍry, is worthy of credence. The Kōmaṭis in their marriage functions and religious celebrations give prominence to certain events which are supposed to have taken place at the time of the self-immolation of Vāsavī. Some of them are the strict observance of the rule of mēnarikam, respect for the Bālanagaramu boys, reverence to Guru Bhāskarāchārya,

and kindness to the Mailāris and Vīramustis, the two castes which rendered service during the period of their trouble with the king of Rājahmundry. Thus, these beliefs of the Komatis also give credence to the story given in the Vaisyapurāṇamu.

The Historicity of the Purāṇamu

The Chālukya king, who laid the foundation of a new city on the banks of the Gōdāvarī, was Rājahmahēndra, also known as Ammā I, and Vishnuvardhana VI. The new city was called after his name Rājahmahēndrapuram (Rājahmundry) and became the capital of Vēngi under his successors. He ruled between A.D. 918-925. Tala 11, son of Yuddhamalla 11 (A.D. 927-934), had the name of Vishnuvardhana. Rājarājanarēndra, who ruled between A.D. 1022-1063, was also named Vishnuvardhana. It is true that many rulers of the Chālukya dynasty had the name of Vishnuvardhana. But, it is not known who among them had fallen in love with the beautiful Kōmati girl, Vāsavī. Even if all the available information about the Chālukyas is considered, it is difficult to identify Vishnuvardhana of the Purāṇamu with any of the Chālukya kings. A critical study of the Vaisyapurāṇamu reveals the fact that its author Bhāskarāchārya had freely referred to and frequently made use of Mahābhārata. The king mentioned in the Purāṇamu and the way his digvijaya(tour) was described suggests that he was no other than Rājarājanarēndra. The descriptive phrases used by Bhāskarāchārya in the Vaiśyapurāṇamu are almost identical with the phrases of Nannaya, who described his beloved patron, Rājarājanarēndra in his Bhārata Avatārika. For example:

Vaiśyapurāṇamu			Bhārata Avatārika	
(1)	Canto	6:7	Canto Adi	1:12
(2)	"	6:8	"	1:3
(3)	"	6:9	"	1:7
(4)	"	6:10	"	1:3
(5)	"	6:11	"	1:7
(6)	"	6:14	"	1:8
(7)	"	7:205	"	1:3
(8)	"	8:98	"	1:7-12

The intention of Bhāskarāchārya in referring to the contents of Mahābhārata of Nannaya may be to give permanence as well as historical importance to his work. But the identification of these two kings cannot take place under any circumstances. The healthy literary tradition built around the name of Rājarājanarēndra has no reference to the account given in the Vaiśyapurāṇamu. K.Sundaram (1968, p.61) writes that "the king might have been a local ruler of a small principality in the region adjacent to Penugoṇḍa". It appears that he was a king of Rājahmunḍry, though information is meagre at present for his identification. On the other hand, the Vaiśyapurāṇamu was written between A.D. 1500-1700 (A.K.T., p, p.207). According to R. Narasimha Rao (Corporate, p.34), it was written in A.D. 1508. Though the account given in the Vaiśyapurāṇamu is based on a late communal work, it can not be rejected as entirely unhistorical. Even though it lacks the proof of historicity, the functioning of Nakaramu in contemporary Karnāṭaka and Tamilnāḍu may be taken to render support to the working of the Nakaramu as described in the

Vaiśyapurāṇamu. Moreover, the communal organisations during the Chālukya period were not known.

CONCLUSION

In fact, the rules laid down in the Vaiśyapurāṇamu with regard to the duties and functions of the Nakaramu are worthy of note. The proceedure fixed for Samaya-sabhā, severe punishments for violation of the Samaya rules and the enforcement of decisions of the Samaya-sabhā upon the members are to be accounted for the efficient functioning of the corporate body of the Nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa.

This account may be brought to a close with the following observations:

(1) The Nakaramu of Penugoṇḍa was a well organised local body of the period. It was a federation of town guilds.

(2) Its assembly is said to have consisted of 102 members. It promoted trade and commerce. It preserved self-government in trade.

(3) Its rules, regulations and functions were admirable. It maintained unity and exercised certain judicial powers.

(4) It produced leaders of the community and supplied bankers to the kings.

(5) It collected taxes and endowed gifts to the temples, which were the centres of cultural activities.

(6) It created facilities for the economic and communal advancement of the Vaiśya community of the Telugu country.

APPENDIX - II

AN INDEX OF REFERENCES

INSCRIPTIONS

Place	Date	District	Source	page number
Agastyēśvaram	S. 910	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.,II p.83	62
Agastyēśvaram	Chalukya Jagadekamalla (S.955-960)	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid, p.183	62
Agastyēśvaram	S. 973	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid, p.81	62
Ahōbalam	S.1531	Kurnool	AR.1915 para 53	223,227,239, 242
Alajanēru	Undated	Chittoor	No.218 of 1932	60
Alaṁpūr	S.978 A.D.1056	Mahbūbnagar	No.112 of 1959-60	209,213
Alaṁpūr	S.989 A.D.1067	Mahbūbnagar	No.115 of 1959-60 Tel.Ins.,II,p.29	39,114,116
Alaṁpūr	Rāshtrakūta period	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.,II,p.175	27,28
Alaṁpūr	S. 995 A.D.1073	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid, p.31	209
Alaṁpūr	S. 998 A.D.1076	Mahbūbnagar	No.117 of 1959-60	209,214
Alaṁpūr	S.1104 A.D.1182	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.,II, p.88 No.157 of 1959-60	168,206, 213
Alampur	C.V.E.23	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins., I, p.192	21,29
Alampur	A.D.1107	Mahbūbnagar	APGAS, 3, p.38	56
Alampur	S.1221	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.II,p.135; CTI, IV, No.36	113,132,169, 170,212
Alampur	S.1225	Mahbūbnagar	HAS,13, pp.167-169	155,161, 169,170
Alampur	Undated	Mahbubnagar	CTI,IV,No.4	25,27
Alaṅguḍi		Tānjōre	SII,VI, No.439	199

Alavānipalli	A.D.1110	Mahbūbnagar	APGAS,3,p.6	110,136
Alavānipalli	C.V.E.34	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.,II,p.57	21,42
Allūru	A.D.1317	Ongōle	NDI, Ongōle 8	21,29,30, 47
Allūru	Undated	Ongōle	NDI, Ongōle 5	43
Amarāvati	S.1080	Guntūr	SII,VI,No.235	28
Amarāvati	S.1416	Guntūr	Ibid,No.219	190,193,197, 198,202,203
Amarāvati	Undated	Guntūr	Ibid,No.220	198
Ammanabrōlu	Undated	Ongōle	NDI, Ongōle 12	58
Anantapūr	S.1109	Anantapūr	CP.No.15 of 1925-26	37
Anantapūr	S.1120(?) S.1223	Anantapūr	CP.No.18 of 1916-17	44
Anantapūr	S.1230	Anantapūr	CP.No.17 of 1916-17	37
Anantapūr	S.1270	Anantapūr	CP.No.8 of 1938-39	45
Anantapūr	S.1273	Anantapūr	CP.No.21 of 1916-17	37
Anantapūr	S.1578	Anantapūr	C.P.No.19 of 1916-17	68
Animala	S.1453	Cuddapah	No.200 of 1937-38	164,169
Animala	S.1453	Cuddapah	No.201 of 1937-38	164,169
Animala	S.1453	Cuddapah	No.202 of 1937-38; APER,No.100 of 1966	164,169
AR			1910 para 60	191
Anumakonda	of the time of Beta	Warangal	HAS,13,p.185	59
Anumakonda	of the time of Vikramāditya VI	Warangal	WDI, No.28	186
Anumakonda	S.1084	Warangal	HAS,18, p.18	91
Appāpuram	S.1327	Guntūr	SII,X,No.573	170

Arasaville	S.1068	Visākhapaṭnam	SII,V,No.1343	32
Arasaville	58th year of Anantavarma		Ibid,No.1342	61
Arikela	S.1314	Chittoor	No.226 of 1932	59
Aṭakulaguṇḍu	S.1292	Kurnool	No.56 of 1953-54	26,40
Ātmakūru	S.1201	Nellōre	NDI, Ātmakūr II	43,57
Attirāla	S.1194	Cuddapah	No.404 of 1911-12	81,86,88,103 111,112,113, 115,116,118
Attirāla	S.1209	Cuddapah	No.406 of 1911-12	120
Attirāla	S.1609	Cuddapah	No.656 of V.R.	119
Avanāsi	Undated	Coimbatore	No.138 of 1909; A.R.1910 para 60	192
Ayyangāripālem	Undated-1 (7th Cent.A.D.)	Guṇṭūr	No.331 of 1936-37	193,194,196
Ayyangāripālem	Undated-2	Guṇṭūr	No.332 of 1936-37	193
Babbelapāḍu	S.1470	Krishna	No.321 of 1924	74
Bādanehālu	Undated	Kurnool	No.488 of 1915	212
Badikāyalapalle	Undated	Chittoor	No.440 of 1914,	60
Bairānipalle	A.D.1108	Warangal	WDI,No.18;CTI,IV, No.8	42,66
Bairānipalle	C.V.E.36	Nalgoṇḍa	Tel.Ins.,II,p.74	60
Bangalore	A.D.1300	Bangalōre	EC.,IX.Bn., 12	66,199
Bangalore	A.D.1306	Bangalōre	Ibid,Dn.110	196
Bāpaṭala	S.1057	Guṇṭūr	SII,VI,No.170	20
Bāpaṭla	S.1066	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.135	28
Bāpaṭla	S.1067	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.129	67
Bāpaṭla	S.1071	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.136	139,172,224, 229,233,234, 237,239
Bāpaṭla	S.1076	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.149	175,176,177, 184,186
Bāpaṭla	S.1076	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.152	175,186

Bāpuram	S.1094 (A.D.1172)	Kurnool	SII,IX(i), No.295	52
Bāsar	S.1070	Adilābād	APER,No.1 of 1966	39,57
Basinikoṇḍa	A.D.1050	Chittoor	No.342 of 1912	124,172,207 215
Bayyāram	13th century	Khammam	EA, 1, p.84	12
Bekkallu	11th century	Waraṅgal	WDI, No.20	20
Bekkallu	A.D.1176	Waraṅgal	Ibid,No.38	195
Bellary	A.D.1177	Bellary	SII,ix(i),No.297	
Bezawāḍa	S.1037	Krishna	SII,IV,No.737	36
Bezawāḍa	S.1163	Krishna	SII,X,No.293	228,237
Bezawāḍa	S.1165	Krishna	SII,X,No.299	230
Bezawāḍa	S.1331	Krishna	SII,IV,774	174,176,179, 184,186,187
Bezawāḍa	S.1348	Krishna	Ibid,No.796	174,176,179,184,186,187
Bezawāḍa	S.1475	Krishna	Ibid,No.797	174,179,182
Bezawāḍa	Undated	Krishna	Ibid,No.784	165,170
Bhaṭṭiprōlu	3rd century B.C.	Guṇṭūr	EI,II,p.328 EI,XV, p.263	18
Bhīmavaram	S.1099	W.Gōdāvari	SII,V,No.70	29,33,48, 200
Bhīmavaram	Undated	W.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.45	42
Bhōgapuram	S.1100	Visākhapaṭnam	SII,X,No.710	57,81,132, 168,170,171
Bhōngir	A.D.1123	Nalgoṇḍa	APER,No.272 of 1966	186
Bichagānipalle	Undated	Anantapūr	No.589 of 1912	38,54
Bōdan	A.D.1056	Nizāmābad	HAS,No.7	55,125,194
Bōdināyanipalle	S. 886	Chittoor	No.180 of 1931-32	52
Bōdināyanipalle	Undated	Chittoor	No.178 of 1931-32	39,52
Boggaram	S.1323	Guṇṭūr	No.205 of 1935-36	162,169,202, 202,214

Bollavarapāḍu	A.D.1153	Oñgōle	NDI,Oñgōle 119	26
Brāhmaṇapalle	S.1212	Cuddapah	No.3 of 1939-40	
Brigubaṇḍa	S.1040	Guñṭūr	No.263 of 1932-33	188
Būḍidepalle	Undated	Chittoor	SII,IX(i),No.4	52
Chañdragiri	Undated	Chittoor	SII,XVII,No.268	193
Chāpalapalli	S.1152	Nellōre	NDI, Veñkaṭagiri-1	102
Chebrōlu	S.1049	Guñṭūr	E.I.,VI,pp.223-227	110
Chēbrōlu	12th century	Guñṭūr	Sundaram(1968)p.28	194
Chējerla	S.1062	Guñṭūr	SII,VI,No.599	190
Chellūru	S.1431	Chittoor	No.419 of 1925	70
Chennupalli	S.1073	Guñṭūr	No.364 of 1916-17	234,235,236
Chiḍipirāla	S.1475	Guñṭūr	No. 209 of 1938	203
Chilkūr	A.D.1067	Hyderābād K.B.Museum	CTI,IV, No.6	133
Chilkūr	Undated	Hyderābād K.B.Museum	CTI,IV,No.5	136
Chilamakūru	S.1140	Oñgōle	NDI,Podili-5	74
Chimaṭa	S.1234	Oñgōle	Ibid, Podili 6	88
Chinakañdukūru	A.D.1214	Khammam	APGAS,15,p.71	48,59
Chinakandukūru	A.D.1243	Khammam	HAS,19, p.4	28,48
Chinakañdukūru	Undated	Khammam	Ibid,19, p.3	30
China Tumbalam	A.D.1142 S.1064	Kurnool	SII,IX(i),No.239	26,51
China Tumbalam	A.D.1229 S.1151	Kurnool	Ibid,No.367	52
Chippagiri	Chālukya Vikramāditya Satyāsraya (A.D.696-733)		Ibid,No.48	20,26
Chiñtapalli	S.1162 A.D.1240	Guñṭūr	No.277 of 1934-35	155,162,167 160,206
"	Undated	"	No 278 of 1934-35	170

Chitramēḷi Edicts: Nos.6 and 18 of 1953-54; No.17 of 1900; HAS, 18, p.94; NDI, Podili 6, Nellore 55,60,61,62,63,65,67,70,71,72 and 74 — 77

Chittāpūr	of the time of K.Pratāparudradēva	Karīmnagar	KDI,No.38	155,161,164 168,170
Dākamarri	S.1071	Visākhapatnam	No.106 of 1960-61	67
Dāvulūru	S.1054	Guntūr	SII,X,No.91	37
Dāvulūru	S.1063	Guntur	Ibid,No.109,	40
Dēsirdoddi	10th century	Chittoor	No.193 of 1932	41
Dharmasāgar	of the time of K.Ganapatideva	Warangal	WDI, No.74	61
Doddimākala	(S.1352)	Kurnool	No.512 of 1915	39
Dōnēkallu	A.D.1059	Anantapūr	SII,IX(i),No.123	41,71
Drākshārāma	S.990	E.Gōdāvari	SII,IV,No.1153	223,224,236
Drākshārāma	S.1060	E.Gōdāvari	SII,IV,No.1154	139,236,
Drākshārāma	S.1061	E.God-āvari	Ibid,No.1139	139
Drākshārāma	S.1064	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.1138	107
Drākshārāma	S.1070	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.1131	237
Drākshārāma	S.1072	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.1091	237
Drākshārāma	S.1075	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.1186	38
Drākshārāma	S.1142	E.Gōdāvari	SII,X,No.264	237
Drākshārāma	S.1366	E.Gōdāvari	SII,IV,No.1375	161,165,169
Drākshārāma	of the time of Kulottunga Rajendra	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.1054	63
Drākshārāma	Undated	E.Gōdavari	No.286 of 1893	110
Duggirāla	S.1136	Guntūr	SII,X,No.261	72
Duggirāla	S.1198	Guntūr	Ibid,No.438	62
Durgi	S.1191	Guntur	Ibid,No.422	42,43,101, 164,169
Durgi	S.1241	Guntur	SII,V,No.526	27
Duvva	Undated	W.Gōdāvari	No.14 of 1929-30	58
Dvārapureddipālem	S.1071	Visākhapatnam	SII,X,No.702	79,80,84, 88,89
Dvārapureddipālem	S.1077	Visākhapatnam	No.366 of 1905	109

Edavalli	S.1079	Guntūr	SII,X,No.141	236,237
Edavalli	S.1162	Guntūr	CP.No.5 of 1915	19
Edavalli	S.1179	Guntūr	SII,X,No.356	194
Ellanūru	Undated	Anantapūr	No.6 of 1953-54	77,86,87, 88
Elūru	A.D.1076	West Gōdāvari	CP.No.3 of 1921-22	110
Elūru	S.1123	W.Gōdāvari	SII,V,No.179	225,237
Emani	S.1047	Guntūr	SII,X,No.81	42
Embadi	of the time of Mahāvali Banarasa	Chittoor	SII,IX(i),No.10	40
Eradukere	S.1051	Anantapūr	No.83 of 1913	110
Ganapavaram	of the time of Kulōttunga Chōda	Guntūr	SII,X,No.122	23,48,50 194,200
Ganapavaram	Undated	Guntūr	No.457 of 1915	48,201,238
Ganapēśvaram	S.1153 A.D.1231	Krishna	EI,III,pp.84-92	210,213
Gangāpuram	S.1013	Mahbūbnagar	APGAS,3, p.10	168,170
Gangāpuram	S.1038 A.D.1116	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid, p.7	138
Gangāpuram	S.1056 A.D.1134	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid,3 p.10	110,168
Gangāpuram	S.1063	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid,15, Ins.13; Ibid,3, p.8	168,170
Gangāpuram	S.1065 A.D.1143	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid, 9, p.71	162,164,168
Gangāpuram	S.1070 A.D.1148	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid, 3, p.9	171
Gang-āpuram	of the time of Chālukya Jagadēkamalla	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.1,p.106	140
Gangāpuram	of the time of Vikramāditya VI	Mahbūbnagar	APGAS,15,p.51	168
Gangāpuram	C.V.E.28	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.1, p.194	57,140
Gangāvaram	S.1179	Cuddapah	No.417 of V.R.	57
Ganikapūdi	S.1197	Guntūr	SII,X,No.435	67

Gaunivāripalli	S.1303	Anantapūr	No.804 of 1917	195,196
Ghantasāla	S.1066	Krihna	SII,X,No.114	227,228,234, 236,242
Ghantasala	S.1066	Krishna	Ibid,No.115	228,234,236, 242
Ghantasala	S.1142	Krishna	Ibid,No.264	234,242
Gobbūru	Of the time of Vikramāditya VI	Raichur	Nos.665,66 of 1958-59	77
Godisala	A.D.1236	Karīmnagar	KDI,No.30	135
Gōtūru	S.1319	Cuddapah	No.384 of 1938-39	23,30,48
Gōtūru	S.1342	Cuddapah	No.385 of 1938-39	23,48
Gudimallam	S.820	Chittoor	I.A.,1911,p.108	47
Gudimallam	S.827	Chittoor	EI,XI,p.228 No.58 of V.R.	46
Gudimallam	Undated-1	Chittoor	No.60 of V.R.	51
Gudimallam	Undated-2	Chittoor	No.63 of V.R.	51
Gudivāda	S.1158	Krishna	SII,V,No.211	68
Gudivāda	S.1159	Krishna	SII,V,No.213	60
Gunimōrubāgal	S.858 A.D.936	Anantapūr	SII,IX(i),No.24	25,40,69, 70
Guntūr	S.1310	Guntūr	SII,X,No.660	228,230,238
Guntūr	S.1326	Guntūr	No.84 of 1917	238
Guntūr	S.1326	Guntūr	Kond.Sam.,p.10	238
Gupta Times			EI,XV,P.128	208
Hēmavati	S.1084	Anantapūr	No.15 of 1917	127
Hēmavati	12th century	Anantapūr	EI, 31, Ins.37	127,132,139, 161,168,170
Hēmavati	Undated	Anantapūr	No.16 of 1917	138
Hindūpūr	S.1109	Anantapūr	CP.No.16 of 1912-13	26
Hyderābad K.B.Museum	A.D.1067		APER,No.148 of 1966	105

Hyderābād K.B.Museum	A.D.1096		CTI,IV,No.10	114
Hyderābād K.B.Museum	A.D.1127		Ibid,No.21	137
Hyderābād Museum	S.1087		No.17 of 1960-61	140
Hyderābād Museum	A.D.1134		APER,No.187 of 1965	39
Iḍupulapāḍu	S.1131	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.248	98
Inkollu	S.1333	Guṇṭūr	No.798 of 1922	57
Jaṁbukēśvaram	Undated	Trichinopoly	No.46 of 1938	193
Jammikuṇṭa	A.D.995	Karīmnagar	APER, No.177 of 1966	61
Jalālapuram	S.1175	Nalgoṇḍa	Tel.Ins.II,p.186	61
Jinigirāvaṇḍla-palli	S.1345	Anaṁtapūr	No.814 of 1917	224,239
Jonnalagaḍḍa	S.1241	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.527	80,87,88, 91
Kaḍparti	A.D.1005	Karīmanagar	KDI,No.10	42
Kalachuṁbarru	Grant of Amma II (A.D.945-97)		EI,VII,p.191	36,38
Kāḷahasti	A.D.1012	Chittoor	SII,XVII,No.328	61,67
Kāḷahasti	A.D.1016	Chittoor	Ibid,No,314	47
Kāḷahasti	47th year of Kulottunga Chōda	Chittoor	No.175 of 1922	49
Kamalāpuram	S.1471	Cuddapah	No.328 of 1938	203
Kaṁbadūr	S.805 A.D.883	Anaṁtapūr	SII,IX(i)No.18	25.39,114
Kaṁbadūr	A.D.965	Anaṁtapūr	Ibid,No.30	28,59
Kaṁbadūr	S.887	Anaṁtapūr	Ibid,No.30	26,28,59
Kammarachōdu	S.976	Kurnool	No.560 of 1915	161
Kanagānipalle	S.1455	Anaṁtapūr	No.340 of 1926	195,202
Karakaṇṭapuram	A.D.1164	Kurnool	SII,X,No.294	230,233,234 236
Kārampūḍi	S.1186	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.81	42,43

Kārampūdi	S.1186	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.402,	42,43
Karavaḍi	S.1232	Ongōle	NDI,Ongole 58	22,29,31, 49,53
Karīmnagar	S.1092	Karīmnagar	HAS,13,Ins.56	105
Karīmnagar	A.D.1246	Kārimnagar	KDI,CP.No.146, Bhārati, 51:1	70
Karshanapalli	Undated	Chittoor	No.331 of 1912	40
Kārumañchi	Undated	Kurnool	No.294 of 1952-53	38
Kaṭukūru	S.1225	Khammam	HAS,19,Km.6	29,31,84,87, 88,92,141,169 173
Kaṭukūru	S.1232	Khammam	Ibid,p.18	22
Khāzipet	A.D.932	Warangal	APGAS,3,p.25	55
Khāzipet	A.D.1090 S.1012	Warañgal	HAS,13,pp.25-31	130,136,133
Khāzipet	(A.D.1076-1126)	Warangal	APGAS,3,p.25	56
Kisṭnapaṭnam	S.1178 A.D.1256	Nellōre	NDI,Gūdūr 39	140,160,211
Kisṭnapaṭnam	S.1201 A.D.1279	Nellōre	Ibid,Gūdur 45	123,160,208, 211,214
Kisṭnapaṭnam	Undated	Nellōre	No.8 of 1928	194
Koḍavalūru	S.1190	Nellōre	NDI,Nellōre 30	70
Kokkirēni	S.1236	Krishna	SII,X,No.507	20,29,54,93
Kolanupāka	A.D.1077	Nalgoṇḍa	SE,Ins.No.7	134
Konakañchi	Undated	Krishna	SII,X,No.544	176,186
Koṇḍapalli	S.1457	Krishna	No.547 of 1925	202
Koṇḍavīḍu	S.1326	Guṇṭūr	No.447 of 1915	238
Koṇḍavīḍu	S.1326	Guṇṭūr	No.448 of 1915	238
Koṇḍaviḍu	S.1445	Guṇṭūr	Kond.Sam., p.5	211
Koṇḍavīḍu	Undated	Guṇṭūr	SII,IV,No.699	64
Koṇḍnāyanivaram	S.1165	Krishna	SII,X,No.299	237
Koneki	A.D.66 9	Krishna	EI,31, Ins.12	95,101

Koniḍēna	S.1069	Guṇṭūr	SII,VI,No.639	29,32
Koniḍēna	S.1357	Guṇṭūr	No.374 of 1915	125
Kopparam	S.1245	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.533	21,29,80,83, 87,88,122
Koravi	of the time of Chālukya Bhīma I	Warangal	HAS, 19, p.126	55
Kōrukoṇḍa	S.1290	E.Gōdāvari	CP.No.71 of 1912-13	63
Kotipi	S.1354	Anantapūr	No.765 of 1917	54
Kūcimanchi	S.1182	Khammam	HAS, 19, p.19	155,162,169, 170
Kūḍali	S.1320	Mahbūbnagar	APER,No.259 cf 1966	42
Kudatani	A.D.1219	Bellary	SII,IX(i),No.336	189
Kulpāk	A.D.1279	Nalgoṇḍa	HAS,19, p.190	20
Kumāradēvam	S.1160	W.Gōdāvari	No.252 of 1935-36	138
Kush Mahal	of the time of K.Gaṇapatideva	Warangal	WDI,No.71, 134	134
Lavanūru	Undated	Cuddapah	No.103 of 1929-30	40,64
Māchерla	S.1033	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.66	101,190,192, 194
Māchеrla	S.1035	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.72	194
Māchеrla	S.1443	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.736	122
Maḍakasira	A.D.950 S.872	Anantapūr	EC,XII,No.36 No.726 of 1916	19,30,39,49
Maḍakasira	A.D.950	Anantapur	SII,IX(i),No.26	19,59
Mādala	S.1073	Guṇṭūr	No.298 of 1932-33	237
Maddipāḍu	A.D.1275	Ongōle	NDI, Ongōle 70	45
Madhuḍi	S.881	Anantapūr	SII,IX(i),No.28	26
Mahabūbābād	Undated	Warangal	HAS,19,p.139	23
Mahadēvamangalam	16th year of the reign of Chōḷa Parakēsarivarman	Chittoor	No.170 of 1931-32	46,49

Mahēndragiri	S.1055	Srīkākulam	SII,V,No.1350	79,88,89
Makhtal	S.1243 A.D.1321	Mahbūbnagar	HAS,19,p.51	21,29,30,54
Malkāpuṛam	S.1499	Guṇtūr	SII,X,No.748	121,122
Mallam	15th year of the reign of Nandipottarasar	Nellōre	NDI, Gūdūr 54	113,123,210,215
Malyāla	S.1208	Kurnool	No.320 of 1937-38	63
Mandaḍam	S.1201	Guṇtūr	SII,IX,No.446	237
Madanapalle	S.1283	Chittoor	CP.No.14 of 1913	45
Mānepalli	of the time of Nolamba Pallava King	Anantapūr	SII,IX(i),No.21	39,59
Maṇūr	S.1236	Medak	HAS,13,No.53	22,31,121
Masulipaṭnam	of the time of Bhima II (A.D.934-45)	Krishna	EI,V,CP. p.134	18,34
Maṭṭewāḍa	of the reign of Gaṇapatidēva	Warangal	HAS, 13,pp.53-55	134
Mēṭeḍu	S.1232	Warangal	Ibid,19, p.145	22,53
Māṭēru	S.1232	Khammam	Ibid,p.30	22
Mēdikonḍūru	S.1240	Guṇtūr	No.313 of 1932-33	23,55,80,88
Mēdikurti	S.1143	Anantapūr	No.18 of 1953-54	87,88,135,138
Mēlaceṟuvu	S.1233	Nalgoṇḍa	CTI,II,No.26	22,31,54,80,84,87,88
Moripirāla	S.1103	Warangal	APGAS,15, p.77	60,62
Mōtupalli	S.1166	Guṇtūr	EI,XII,No.22,	172
Mōtupalli	S.1280	Guṇtūr	SII,X,No.556	172, 160
Mukhalingam	S.1006	Srīkākulam	Ibid,V,No.1097	84
Mukhalingam	S.1014	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.116	23
Mukhalingam	S.1045	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1094	24
Mukhalingam	S.1045	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1090	24
Mukhalingam	S.1053	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1089	24
Mukhalingam	S.1054	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1056	24,79
Mukhalingam	S.1054	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1081	89

Mukhaliṅgam	S.1055	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1052	32
Mukhaliṅgam	S.1056	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1016	79,84,85,88, 89
Mukhaliṅgam	S.1063	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1143	135,225
Mukhaliṅgam	S.1072	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1018	79,85,89
Mukhaliṅgam	S.1107	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No,1135	33,65
Mukhaliṅgam	Undated-1	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1038	180,185
Mukhaliṅgam	Undated-2	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1051	83,85,180 185,187
Mukhaliṅgam	Undated-3	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1076	83,89,180, 185,187
Mukhaliṅgam	Undated-4	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1077	24
Mukhaliṅgam	Undated-5	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1106	24
Mukhaliṅgam	37th year of Gaṅga Anantavarma	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1029	80,85,89
Muṅgamūru	S.1185	Oṅgōle	NDI,Kavali 43	80,88,90
Mysore	A.D.1372	Mysōre	EC,IV,Gu.4	197
Nadagam	A.D.1058	Srīkākulam	EI,IV, p.185	109
Nādenḍla	S.1046	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.82	223,228,229, 235
Nādenḍla	Undated-1	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,IV,No.812	177,181,182, 184,187
Nādenḍla	Undated-2	Guṇṭur	Ibid,No.668	176,187
Nādenḍla	Undated-3	Guṇṭur	Ibid,No.221	181,184,187
Nādenḍla	Undated-4	Guṇṭur	Ibid,IV,No.663	200
Nādenḍla	Undated-5	Guṇṭur	SII,IV,No.667	200
Naḍigallu	S.1167 A.D.1245	Chittoor	No.83 of 1953-54	112,114,207
Naḍigūḍem	S.1222	Krishna	SII,X,No.489	20,50,53
Naḍigūḍem	S.1236	Krishna	Ibid,No.508	50
Nāgulapāḍu	S.1225	Nalgoṇḍa	CTI, II,No.30	21,50,84, 92,201.

Nalajanapāḍu	Undated	Chittoor	EI,XVII,p.203	45
Nandalūru	S.1231	Cuddapah	SII,X,No.496	69
Nandalūru	S.1355	Cuddapah	No.606 of 1097	111,115,117
Nandavaram	S.1214	Kurnool	No.5 of 1943-44	
Nandipillar (near Jutūr)	S.1213	Kurnool	No.55 of 1943-44	63
Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1024	Visākhapaṭnam	SII,X,No.654	88
Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1050	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid,No.671	27,79,89,90
Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1054	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid,No.679	25,27
Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1059	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid,No.689	89
Nārāyaṇapuram	S.1105	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid,No.712	27
Narnēpāḍu	S.1073	Guṇṭūr	No.317 of 1932-33	59
Narnēpāḍu	S.1093	Guṇṭūr	No.320 of 1932-33	40
Nasanakōṭa	S.1273	Anantapūr	CP.No.17 of 1925-26	37
Nawābupēṭa	S.1216	Krishna	SII,X,No.477	87
Nayakallu	S.889	Kurnool	No.290 of 1952-53	155,168
Nēlapalli	Undated	Chittoor	No.242 of 1918	124,132
Nellōre	S.1119	Nellōre	NDI,Nellōre 55	77,79,81,86, 87,88,90,103, 112,115,117, 119,210,211, 214
Nellōre	S.1225	Nellōre	CP.No.10 of 1918-19	166
Nellōre	S.1244	Nellōre	CP.No.11 of 1918-19	167
Nellōre	S.1286 A.D.1364	Nellōre	NDI,Nellōre 73 No.80 of 1953-54	164,169,208, 214
Nellōre	S.1495	Nellōre	NDI,Nellōre 54	196,203
Nellore	Undated-1	Nellōre	CP.No.9 of 1918-19	168,169
Nellōre	Undated-2	Nellōre	NDI,Nellōre 50	200

Nemali	13th year of Chōla Parakēsarivarman	Chittoor	No.152 of 1942-43	51
Nemali	28th year Rāshtrakūta Kannaradeva	Chittoor	No.150 of 1942-43	51
Nīlaru	Of the time of Satyāsraya	Anantapūr	SII,IX(i),No.50	54
Ongōle	S.1194	Ongōle	NDI,Ongōle 101	29,73
Pākāla	S.1242 A.D.1320	Ongōle	Ibid,Kandukūr 54,55	135,225,237
Pālagiri	Undated	Cuddapah	No.324 of 1935-36	209
Pālakōl	S.1091	W.Gōdāvari	SII,V,No.162	79,88,89,90
Pālakōl	S.1222	W.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.130	64
Pālakōl	Undated	W.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.158	197,200,202 199,201,
Pālem	Undated	Mahbūbnagar	CTI,III,No.31	73
Pāmāpuram	S.1200	Mahbūbnagar	Ibid,No.32	42
Pāmulapādu	Undated	Guntūr	SII,X,No.98	21,50
Panchadhārla	S.1359	Visākhapatnam	Ibid,VI,No.656	201
Panem	Undated	Kurnool	No.549 of V.R.	45
Pānugallu	Undated	Nalgonda	HAS,19, p.114	39,42
Pātapalli	Undated	Anantapūr	No.42 of 1953-54	61
Patamcheruvu	Western Chālukya period	Medak	CTI, IV, No.9	132
Pedagārlapādu	S.1183	Guntūr	No.29 of 1929-30	61,63
Pedakodamagundlu	S.1069	Guntūr	SII,X,No.119	63
Pedakondūru	S.1239	Guntūr	Ibid,No.521	45,121
Peddakadumūru	3rd regnal year of the Kālachūri king Ahavamalladēva	Mahbūbnagar	Tel.Ins.II p.87	115,167,171, 207,211,215
Peddakallēpalli	Undated	Krishna	No.160 of V.R.	201
Pedda Tumbalam	S.1026 A.D.1166	Kurnool	SII,IX(i),No.172	26,51

Peda Tumbalam	S.1070 A.D.1148	Kurnool	Ibid,No.250	51
Penugonda	Undated	W.Gōdāvari	Castes, III, p.323	241
Penukonda	Undated	Anantapūr	SIII,VII,No.552	25
Pērūru	S.1041 A.D.1119	Nalgonda	CTI,IV,No.12	20,29,83, 131,135
Pērūru	S.1181 A.D.1260	Nalgonda	Ibid,No.32; AS,38, Pērūru	65,66
Pērūru	of the time of Kandūr Bhīma Chōda	Nalgonda	AS,38,p.8	130,135,137
Petlūru	Undated	Ongōle	No.446 of 1938-39	66
Pillalamarri	S.1130	Nalgonda	Tel.Ins.1, p.37	61,63
Pithāpuram	of the time of Vīra Chōda (S.1024)	E.Gōdāvari	EI,V CP,pp.70-100	19
Pithāpuram	S.1108	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,IV,p.53	110,120
Polasa	A.D.1108	Karīmnagar	KDI,No.75	155,206,214
Potlapalli	S.988	Karīmnagar	Ibid,No.16	61
Prattipādu	S.1089	Guntūr	SII,X,No.161	223,228,230, 234,237,239
Pushpagiri	S.1222	Cuddapah	APER,No.56 of 1965	20,70
Pyālakurti	S.1310	Kurnool	CP.No.4 of 1960-61	37
Rājahmundry	S.1067	E.Gōdāvari	SII,X,No.116	228,229,236
Rājahmundry	S.1117	E.Gōdāvari	Ibid,No.205	187,237
Rājasāvaram	S.1223	Medak	CTI,IV,No.37	133,169
Rāmāpuram	8th century	Cuddapah	APER,No.II of 1966	104
Rāmēśvaram	Undated	Cuddapah	No.572 of V.R.	51
Rāvulacheruvu	S.1109(?)	Anantapūr	CP.No.5 of 1952-53	44
Rāzōle	Undated	E.Gōdāvari	SII,V,No.1346	24
Rellivalasa	S.1053	Visākhapatnam	Ibid,X,No.674	89,109
Rellivalasa	S.1075	Visākhapatnam	Ibid,No.708	46,65

Saṅgamēśvaramu	A.D.1173	Kurnool	No.32 of 1942-43 APER, No.212 of 1966	123,210,214
Sanigaram	A.D.1051	Karīmnagar	KDI, No.14	29
Sanigaram	A.D.1052	Karīmnagar	Ibid, No.15	38
Sanigaram	A.D.1107	Karīmnagar	Ibid, No.19	61
Sanigaram	A.D.1128 S.1050	Karīmnagar	Ibid, No.22	61
Sannigaṇḍla	A.D.1318	Guṇṭūr	IHC, 1954, p.244	122
Sarajammanahalli	Undated	Anantapūr	No.729 of 1917 A.R.1918 para 85	114,161,174
Sāraṅgupalle	S.1230	Guṇṭūr	No.387 of 1926	173
Sarpavaram	S.1334	E.Gōdāvari	SII, V, No.26	29,69,71
Sattravāḍa	Undated	Chittoor	No.387 of 1911	117,123
Siddhavaṭam	S.1529	Cuddapah	No.932 of V.R.	119
Simhāchalam	S.1026	Visākhapaṭnam	SII, VI, No.1173	212
Simhāchalam	S.1129	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid, No.1199	33,65
Simhāchalam	S.1213	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid, No.904	63
Simhāchalam	S.1228	Visākhapaṭṇam	Ibid, No.1179 also Nos.722,751,769, 903	198,201
Simhāchalam	S.1275	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid, No.1046	33
Simhāchalam	S.1309	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid, V, No.945	192
Simhāchalam	S.1321	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid, VI, No.870	68
Simhāchalam	S.1332	Visākhapaṭnam	Ibid, No.878	68
Siṅgarikoṇḍa	S.1365	Ongōle	NDI, O.32	29
Siṅgavaram	S.1127	Srīkākulam	SII, X, No.713	33,137
Siripuram	S.1093	Guṇṭūr	No.335 of 1932-33	62
Srīkākulam	S.1220	Srīkākulam	SII, IV, No.884	169
Srīkākulam	Undated	Srīkākulam	Ibid, No.972	190,197,202
Srīurmam	S.1035	Srīkākulam	Ibid, V, No.1316	183,184,186
Srīkūrmam	S.1071	Srīkākulam	Ibid, No.1332	24,46

Srīkūrmam	S.1074	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1333	24
Srīkūrmam	S.1091	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1330	24
Srīkūrmam	S.1152	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1290	33,72
Srīkūrmam	S.1167	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1294	79,80,83, 88,90
Srīkūrmam	S.1271	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1191	198
Srīkūrmam	12th regnal year of Bhanudēva	Srīkākulam	Ibid,No.1156	198
Srīrangapuram	Undated	Anantapūr	No.22 of 1927-28	58
Srīśailam	S.1235	Kurnool	SII,X,No.504	105
Tadikalapūdi	S.1138	Krishna	Ibid,V,No.197	24
Tangaturu	S.1237	Cuddapah	No.432 of 1911	113,115,118
Tangaturu	S.1652	Cuddapah	No.885 of V.R.	115,120
Tangeda	S.1230	Guntūr	SII,X,No.495	20,22,29,31, 54,122,169
Tangeda	S.1313	Guntur	Ibid,No.565	164,169,173
Tangeda	of the time of Komaragirireddi	Guntur	Ibid,No.567	156,169,170
Tangeda	S.1450	Guntur	No.374 of 1926	52
Tangedumalli	S.1037	Guntūr	SII,X, No.73	98
Tēki plates	S.1006 A.D.1084	E.Gōdāvari	EI,VI,p.334	174,175,176, 177,181,178
Tēkmal	S.1230	Medak	HAS,13, p.198	22,30,53
Tirukkachūr	Undated	Tamilnād	AR,1912 para 72	189
Tirukkōilūr	Undated	Tamilnād	SII,VII,No.129 No.117 of 1900	78
Tirupati	of the time of Kapilēsvara	West Gōdavari	SII,V,No.100	71
Tiruchchānūr	12th century	Chittoor	Ibid,XVII,No.285	65
Tiruttani	Undated-1	Chittoor	No.305 of V.R.	50
Tiruttani	Undated-2	Chittoor	No.316 of V.R.	50

Tiruttani	Undated-3	Chittoor	No.297 of V.R.	50
Tiruttani	Undated-4	Chittoor	No.296 of V.R.	62
Tiruttani	Undated-5	Chittoor	No.299 of V.R.	65
Tiruvālangāḍu	A.D.1118	Chittoor	No.326 of V.R.	50
Tripurāntakam	S.1174	Kurnool	SII,X,340	91,225
Tripurāntakam	S.1192	Kurnool	Ibid,No.429	128,130,135, 141,169
Tripurāntakam	S.1214	Kurnool	Ibid,No.473	128,155,162, 169,171
Tripurāntakam	S.1218	Kurnool	Ibid,No.480	68,128,169, 171
Tripurāntakam	S.1309	Kurnool	No.275 of 1905	128,169
Tsandavōlu	S.1093	Guṇṭūr	EI,VI, p.268	111
Tumbalam	A.D.1106	Kurnool	S.II,IV(i),No.172	51
Tumbalam	A.D.1142	Kurnool	Ibid,No.239	51
Udayagiri	Undate-1	Nellōre	NDI,Udayagiri 20	194,195
Udayagiri	Undated-2	Nellōre	Ibid,No.21	199,201
Uṇḍavalli	S.1448	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.737	227,236,239
Uppuguṇḍūru	S.1140	Ongōle	NDI, Ongole 139	30,102
Uppumāgulūru	Undated	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.540	30
Uttaramērūr	of the time of Parantaka I		K.A.N.Sastri, 1932, pp.131 ff	18
Vaiśya gōtras	: A.R. 1918 para 84 and 85; Gazetteer of the East Gōdāvari district, 1915, pp.54 ff, Castes, III, pp.312 ff; Harivamsamu, p.79 Kond.Sam.p.10; Local Records, Vol.I, pp.202-203, M.S. Sarma, Telugu Samskriti, Vol.3, pp.15 ff; SII,X,Nos.82,114,115,161, 264,293,299,446 and 737; SII,IV,Nos.85,99, 220,447,448,449,451,452,453,464,465,512, 660 and 940; Nos. 504 of 1915, 74 of 1917, 323 of 1919, 268 of 1924, 814 of 1917.			223
Valivēru	S.983	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.8	107
Valivēru	S.1026	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.61	194,200

Vangīpuram	Undated	Guṇṭūr	No.809 of 1922	239
Vaṅkāyalapāḍu	S.1693	W.Gōdāvari	No.422 of 1915	240
Vardhamānapuram	A.D.1224	Mahbūbnagar	HAS,19, p.94	110
Vardhamānapuram	A.D.1229	Mahbūbnagar	APGAS,3,p.14	138,139
Vēlpūru	S.1227	Guṇṭūr	No.576 of 1925	185,187
Vēmūr	S.1050	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.86	32
Vēmulavāḍa	A.D.1106	Karīmnagar	KDI,No.20	62
Vēmulavāḍa	of the time of Chālukya Arikēsari	Karīmnagar	Ibid,No.2	62
Visākhapaṭnam	S.1012	Visākhapaṭnam	SII,X,No.651	129,134,227
Visākhapaṭnam	S.1172	Visākhapaṭnam	SII,X,No.211	138
Voppicherla	S.1221	Guṇṭūr	SII,X,No.488	20,29,61
Vurukuṇḍe	S.1328	Kurnool	No.496 of 1915	57
Vurukuṇḍe	Undated	Kurnool	No.495 of 1915	53
Waraṅgal	A.D.1228	Waraṅgal	HAS,13,pp.57-61	134,140,160, 169,207
Waraṅgal	Undated	Waraṅgal	WDI,No.62	135
Yāḍiki	Undated	Anantapūr	Nos.33,34,35 of 1958	70
Yarraguḍi	Undated	Kurnool	No.637 of 1917	70
Yelañji	S.1478	Anantapūr	No.473 of 1923	56
Yenamadala	S.1173	Guṇṭur	SII,X,No.381	169
Yenamadala	S.1185	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,IV,No.934	80,83,88
Yenamadala	S.1191	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.935	155,169,171
Yenamadala	S.1310	Guṇṭūr	Ibid,No.940	228,237
Yenamadala	S.1327	Guṇṭūr	No.74 of 1917	238
Yenamadala	Undated	Guṇṭūr	EI,III, p.96	121
Yenamalakuduru	S.1152	Krishna	SII,VI,No.99	228,230
Yenamalakuduru	S.1159	Krishna	Ibid,No.96	110
Yōgimallavaram	A.D.1229	Chittoor	Ibid,XVII,No.304	65
Zūpūḍi	Undated	Krishna	No.160 of 1913	238
Zuzzūru	S.1124	Krishna	SII,X,No.209	177,180,184, 187

-.-

APPENDIX - III

GLOSSARY

Abhayaśāsanamu = an edict assuring safety

Āchāri = a suffix of the members of the Viśvakarma community

Ācamdrārkamu = for all times

Adda = a measure of two mānikas or half a Kumcamu or 1/4 tūmu (4 addalu = 1 tūmu; 20 tūmulu = 1 putti); a centre

Addagada-sunkamu = a tax levied on goods at the market

Addagādi = a tub or a firepan kept at a central place

Addanūllu = a sect of oil-mongers

Addavatta-sunkamu = a tax collected from traders on their income by sale of various commodities in the market

Addavatta-sunkarulu = persons employed to collect addavatta-sunkamu

Addugu = half a fanamu

Adhikāri = an officer; manager; superintendent

Agrahāramu or Akaramu = a rent free village granted to Brāhmins or Vaiśyas; a village granted to Brāhmins in general for sustenance

Ahanas = divisions of the artisan community

Ainnūrruvar = The guild of the Five-hundred viz the merchants

Akkasāla or Akhasāli = a goldsmith

Aksapataludu = a keeper of record-room

Akhamdadīpamu or Aksayadīpamu = a perpetual lamp

Akṣayapuṇyamu = in-exhaustible religious merit

Akhiladēśala-Teliki-vēguru = The Teliki-1000 community of various territories

Alamu = field

Amaramu = feudal tenure

Aṁbaṣṭuḍu = a barber

Aṁgajītamu = personal salary

Aṁgaḍa-siddāyamu = fixed fees collected from each shop or stall

Aṁgaraṁgabhōgālu = decoration and illumination of God

Aṁgarakṣha = a body-guard

Aṁgaḍi-mudra-suṅkamu = a tax levied for affixing seal on the produce brought for sale in the market

Amgaḍi-nāyakuḍu = a person in charge of a market; superintendent of market

Ammekaḍa-suṅkamu = a tax levied at the market on articles of trade

Amjjivaṇṇatu-vyāpāri = a member of the trade guild

Anumagoṇḍalu = a sect of oil-mongers

Aṅtarāyamu = a tax per plough; a tax levied on certain goods

Aṅtavaṭṭu = to that extent; all; the whole

Appanamu = a tax; a tribute

Aputrikadaṇḍamu = a kind of forced tax

Ārāma = a shrine; a resting place

Ari = a tax levied on oil-mills; tribute

Asēṣa = all

Aṣṭabhōgas	= a kind of land tenure; eight rights of full possession of land. They are: (1) nidhi (treasure-trove) (2) nikṣepa (under-ground deposits) (3) jala (water-reservoirs) (4) pāṣāṇa (stones, mines, quarries) (5) akṣiṇi (actual privileges or present profit (6) āgāmi (future profits) (7) sidha or sidhāya (land already brought under cultivation (8) sādhya (waste land that may in future be brought under cultivation).
Aṣṭādaśa-prajalu	= eighteen communities or castes
Ayirāni-rūka	= a marriage-tax
Āyigāṁḍlu	= village-servants
Āyamu	= a measure; extent; income from taxes
Baisanige	= a representative meeting of the merchants
Baccu	= a banker; a treasurer; a money-lender
Bāhattaraniyōgādhipati	= Head of the 72 Niyōgas (departments) or all the departments.
Bali	= a tax; royal income
Balañja-dharmamu	= the customary observances of the guild of the Balañjas
Balañje-kāryamu	= the profession of the Balija community
Baṁgārugadyamu	= a gold coin
Baṁḍāramu; Bhaṁḍāramu	= a treasury
Bananjuvaṭṭaṇa	= a town of the merchants
Bārikāpu	= a village watchman

Bezawādaśāsanudu	= a resident of Bezawāda; a member of the Teliki guild
Bhaṁḍāravyāpāri	= the setti of the State attached to the treasury for procuring various commodities for the State or Royal palace.
Bhāga	= king's customary share of the produce
Bhanḍāri	= the State trader attached to the treasury
Bhaṭṭa-vritti	= a grant of land to scholars or bards
Bhōga	= rights on land enjoyed by the landlord
Bhūmi	= a group of villages
Bhūmiputrulu	= cultivators
Biḍḍabiḍḍataramu	= generation after generation
Bighas	= a measure of land
Brahmapuri	= a part of a town gifted to Brahmin scholars
Brahmādāyamu	= inām land granted to brāhmins
Bōgaramu-pannu	= a tax; a tax on artisans; profession tax?
Birudagadyalu or Biruda-māḍalu or rūkalu	= coins with a distinctive mark or value
Bīranamu-bīraṇamu	= a kind of tax on wares
Bittuvāṭa	= a tax free gift made to a person who built a tank or repaired it or maintained it.
Burṟa-suṅkamu	= poll tax
Busibhaṁḍālu	= all sorts of grain contained in pods
Cālumūla-Ubhaya-Nānādeśāla-Pekkaṁdru	= the itinerant merchants belonging to local, neighbourly and foreign territories; the traders of different places

Cātu	= a pleasing word
Cāvadi	= an office, a group of villages
Calivaṁdiri	= a water-shed
Chavaka-bhūmi	= a kind of land
Chitramēḷi	= the guild of cultivators, a plough
Dageḍe	= a measure of clothes
Dānādhikāri	= an officer in charge of grants
Daṇḍanāyaka	= a ranking military official, ruler of a division
Daṇḍapāṭa	= an administrative division
Dēśi	= a territorial division comprising a group of villages; the guild of native merchants
Dēśiraṭṭaḍlu	= persons who belonged to the agricultural community
Dēśimukhya	= the head of the dēśi merchants
Dēśiyābharaṇa	= a jewel among the local merchants
Dēvadāna	= a gift to the temple
Dharmāsana	= a village court or seat of justice
Dharmaśāsanamu	= a charitable edict
Dīnāras	= coins in general
Drammabadivīsamu	= a vīsa (1/16) for sale price of each a dramma
Drammamu	= one sixteenth of a nishka; drachma weight standard of silver or gold coins
Dunneprajalu	= tillers of the soil
Dvīpāntara-vyavahārulu	= traders who were engaged in the overseas trade

Eda-sunkamu	= a duty paid along with offerings to the deity
Ekabhōgamu	= a sole and entire right of enjoyment of land or village
Ekāngavirudu	= a warrior fighting singly
Emdumu or Edumu	= a land measure denoting five nakarams or 5 tūmus and 1/4 putti; two ēmdumulu= 1 pamdumu; two pamdumlu= 1 putti or khandika. Endumu = 5 Nakaramulu; 10 Nakaramulu = pamdumu; 20 Nakaramulu = 1 putti.
Enamamdumu	= 8 tūmus
Eragadyānamu	= a kind of coin
Fanam	= chinna, a kind of coin
Gadapapannu	= a house tax
Gadēśasis	= managers of ghatikas
Gadya	= a golden coin, a varāha
Gandamāda	= half of a niska
Gandhi-sunkālu	= taxes levied on sales of perfumes or cosmetics
Gāndlavāru; Gānugulavāru	= the Telikis
Gānugu or Gānuvu	= an oil-mill
Gātrigās	= constituents of the guild of Five hundred viz., the merchants
Gavares	= basket-makers; guild of corn merchants and constituents of the Five hundred viz. the merchants

Garudamānika	= a measure
Garuvubhūmi	= a kind of land
Gāundas or Gāunda-praja	= farmers; heads of the households; the headman of the people
Gidda	= 1/4 of a sōla
Ghattivaraha	= a kind of coin
Ghadiyāramu	= a clock; a Vedic school
Ghadiputti	= a measure of land
Ghatikasthānamu	= a Vedic school
Gōkanagadyālu	= a kind of coins
Goragari	= a Śaiva mendicant
Goravas	= priests
Gōshthi	= trustee
Gōrōjanālu	= a kind of paddy
Gorru	= 32 kuntas of land; a measure
Gōtra	= a sept; a family or tribe or lineage or caste
Grāmabhōgāstakamu	= the eight enjoyments or rights. They are (1) priesthood of the village (2) profession of sacrificial priest (3) ownership of the village (4) profession of Astrologer (5) Examination of the seals of coinage (6) Palmist (7) preparation of copies of ancient works and (8) right of performing sacrifices or appointing sacrificial priests.

Grāmasākshi	= the villagers as witness
Grāmakārakulu	= village servants
Grāmakārya	= work pertaining to the village assembly
Grāmani or Grāmasvāmi	= the village headman
Grāmavibhudu	= the village headman
Grāmēyakulu	= villagers
Grāsa-grāmamulu	= supporting villages
Gudikattu	= levy for a temple or the total extent of land under a village or village account
Hadinentu-samaya	= eighteen castes
Hadinentu-vishaya	= eighteen districts
Halaru	= many
Hedābukas	= horse-dealers
Here-suṅka	= a tax on heringa trade
Heggade or pergade	= an officer; an accountant; the headman; a minister
Hēruva-praja	= merchants of pack-bullock loads
Hejjuṅka	= a tax
Hana	= a kind of coin
Hīnavādulu	= mean people
Honna	= a kind of coin
Idaras	= toddy sellers
Illari	= a tax on houses
Iṁdlu	= houses
Iṁdula	= herein
Iṁtavattu	= thus far
Intivāru	= okkalu or households

Invari	= a tax paid to the assembly of a community
Jayamāda	= a kind of coin
Jīvadhanamu	= live-stock
Jītabhukti	= wages for the livelihood
Jītavartana	= payment of wages for the livelihood
Kaddāyamu or Khaddyamulu	= to purchase goods at high prices
Kalnādu	= a gift made to the heirs of a hero
Kalañju	= a gold coin
Kalugādi or Dharmagādi	= a stone tub intended to store water for drinking by cattle
Kalutūmu	= a sluice made of stone
Kālputlu	= one fourth of a putti
Kalamaruturu	= one fourth of a maruturu
Kampanamu	= a group of villages
Kamma-Kōmati	= a Vaiśya belonging to the Kammanādu
Kammāsāri	= a blacksmith
Kampulu	= cultivators
Kāmpu	= a guard, a watchman, a protector
Kanarivīsālu	= a kind of coins
Kangani	= a place-decorator
Karanīkapumānyamu	= the rent free land given for performance of the office of Karnam
Karanīkavartana	= a tax paid to Karnam
Karamu	= a tax or toll or tribute
Karanam	= a village accountant
Karanāyamu	= a tax levied on fields

Kārtika Vaiśākhalu	= the crop yielded in the two months of Kārtika and Vaiśākha in an year
Kāśa or Kāśe	= a mason or a stone cutter
Kāsu	= a coin in general
Kaṭṭadi, Kaṭṭu or Kaṭṭada	= an order, a rule, a regulation
Katte	= customs station
Kavullāyamu	= lease fees
Kavile	= a record
Kēsariaḍḍugulu or gadya or Kesarivīsamu	= a kind of coin called Kēsari
Khaṇḍuga	= 1 puṭṭi of land
Kolabhaṇḍālu	= a bullock-cart load
Koḷaga	= a measure
Koḍage	= rent free gift granted to a person
Kūḍuvaṭana or Kūḍujītamu	= the grant for the purpose of daily food and maintenance
Kulakaraṇi or Sēnabōva	= a village accountant
Kulasiddhāyamulu	= a tax collected from the members of a caste
Kuli	= a land measure
Kulika	= an artisan; a merchant
Kulōttuṅgamāḍalu	= the coins issued by Kulōttuṅga
Kuṁcamu	= a measure of four māṇikas
Kummari	= a potter
Lēkhaka	= a clerk or writer

Leṁka	= Royal companion
Lavaṇākarādhikāri	= superintendent of salt; an excise officer
Māḍa	= a kind of coin or half of a pagōḍa
Madhyasta	= an accountant; an arbitrator
Magama	= contribution
Mahājanas	= Brāhmin shareholders in agrahāras
Mahāgrāmamu	= a great village
Mahānāḍu	= the largest local assembly in which the guilds were prominent
Mahattaras	= elders; the elite of a village
Māktā	= a kind of land tenure
Maliga-suṅkam	= shop dues
Māna	= a measure
Maṇḍalamu	= a division of a country or province
Maṇḍalikaṁpulu	= headmen of the villages with a rank superior to ordinary headmen; heads of territorial divisions(?)
Maṇḍalikas	= governors of divisions of a country
Maṇḍalamaryādalu	= the custom of the country
Maṇigāra	= a manager; a supervisor
Mallamāḍa	= a kind of coin
Mannēya	= a feudatory
Maṅtri	= a minister
Maṟuturu	= a land measure, equivalent to Nivartana
Mēras	= fees collected for the village servants
Minuki	= a gift of land
Mēnarikamu	= practice of marrying sister's daughter to his son

Modali = the headman

Modadlakāmpulu = the principal cultivators of the village

Mūlavīsālu = fees levied on articles brought for sale

Mukhamandapamu = a quadrangle hall in front of the temple or the entrance porch of a temple

Mummuridandas = advance guards of a caravan and the constituents of the Five hundred viz. the merchants

Mudlu = a headman of the village(?)

Mudiseli = personal guard of a king(?), a mark of distinction

Nādu = a territorial division comprising a group of villages; an assembly of the Nādu

Nādgāunda or Nāda-prabhu = a non-official head of a Nādu

Nāda-nāluka = a spokesman of the Nādu

Nakaramu = a merchant guild; the town assembly

Nakarapurusudu = the headman of the merchant community

Nakarapuvāda = the merchant quarter of a town

Nagaras = merchants; the heads of town assembly

Nagara = a town; the town assembly

Nagara-maryāda = municipal self-government

Nagaramulōnivāru = the merchant community of a town

Nagara-śrēshthi = a mayor or the town head

Nagaru = the state treasury

Nāgasthambhamu = a stone pillar chiselled with the image of a serpent

Nānādēśi = merchants coming from various territories

Nānādēśi-nagara-saṁghamu = the guild of merchants belonging to local and various other places or the guild of Ubhaya-nānādēśi

Nānādēśi-pekkaṁdru = the guild of many itinerant merchants

Nandimaṇḍapamu = the porch of the temple in which the image of the sacred bull is kept.

Nāyaka = the headman of a village; a title

Nāyuḍu = a title; a cultivator

Nīllapullari = tax for using tank water for cultivation

Nīrnēla = wet land; a kind of land

Niyama = restraint of mind

Niyōga = an office

Okkalu = farmers and their assembly

Ōju = a suffix to the names of architects

Oṭṭu = a vow or promise

Paduvāraṁbha = a kind of fine; transfer fee

Pagoḍa = a kind of coin

Pālikāṁpu = a shareholder

Palya-pannu or Palyaṁ-payiṇḍi = a kind of tax

Pahiṇḍi = told; money

Paṁpuna = order; authority; at the behest; on behalf of

Paṇam = a measure

Pañcalōhādhipatulu = persons who were engaged in the five metals, viz. gold, silver, copper, tin and lead

Pañcāhanamvāru or Pañcādulu = the five artisan classes

Pañcalōhālabēhāramu = trading in the five metals

Pañcakaranādhipati = the head of the five offices?

Pañcānana = Five faces, Viśvakarma

Pañcārāmamulu = the five ārāmas, such as Drākshārāma, Bhīmavaram, Pālakōl, Gumupūdi and Amarāvati.

Pañcavārim = a committee of the village assembly

Pannugūdu = a levy of tax

Paradēśi = itinerant traders

Parihāras = exemptions; immunities of agrahāras

Paradēsibēhārulu = merchants belonging to neighbouring territories

Pasāyita = master of robes

Pattanasetti or Pattanasvāmi = the head of the town assembly

Pātika = a kind of coin; 1/4 of any thing

Perikes = sacks used for selling merchandise; at present a caste

Pemdlisuñkamu or Pemdli-rūka or Pemdlitera or Pemdliāyamu = a tax on marriage

Pemtasuñkamu = fees levied on sales of articles in a market place

Penugondaśāsanudu = a headman of the guild of Penugonda

Perumbadi = the market road, a shrine

Pēta = the ward in a town

Poli = interest, an oblation of food, a part

Prabhu-mukhyulu	=	the chief heads
Prabhugāundas	=	the village headmen
Praja	=	inhabitants of a village
Praśasti	=	eulogy ~~or faith~~
Prithvīsetti	=	the head of the sthala merchants
Pullarimānyamu	=	land granted exempting grazing tax
Pullari	=	grass tax or tax on pasture lands
Pūntaku	=	a decision of elders
Pura	=	a town
Purahari	=	the town headman
Puravari	=	a revenue officer, the town head(?)
Putti	=	the extent of land that produces one putti of grain
Putti-kuṁcālu	=	a Kuṁcamu of grain for every putti of land
Rācapuravari	=	the revenue officer of the State
Rācavyavahāri	=	the setti of the State
Raddikamu or Rattadikamu	=	an office of the village headman
Ratha	=	a temple chariot
Rāstrakūta	=	the headman of a village
Rāstrakūta-pramukhas	=	the chief cultivators
Rathakārās	=	the artisans
Reddi or Raddi	=	the village headman
Rātnamu or mōṁta	=	a water lifting pulley
Rudirapatti	=	a rent free gift
Rūka	=	a coin
Sādamu	=	a kind of tax
Sadbhāga	=	one-sixth payable to the king
Sāmantas	=	feudatories

Samaya = caste; community; guild

Samayamu = convention; compact; agreement or religious obligation

Samaya-chakravarti = the president of a guild

Samayadaṇḍamu = punishment as per the established custom or regulation

Samayadharma = rules of the caste or guild

Samayadrōhulu = persons who contemplate of doing harm to the agreement

Samayakāryamu = the affairs relating to the guild or society or religion

Samayamantri = minister for communal affairs; the secretary of the guild

Samayamu-paṭṭa = the regulation of the guild

Samaya-sabhā = community meeting

Samayasēnāpati = the head of the army of the guild

Saṁtanakaramu = the guild of merchants in the market or fair

Samastapraja = the entire community; all the people

Samudāya or Samūha = an assembly

Sandhāta = a village officer

Sapta-saṁtanas = seven acts of piety, such as temple construction, tank construction, planting of a grove, hoarding of a treasure, marriage of a girl to a Brāhmin, procreation of a son and composition of a poem

LIBRARY

Sāni = dēva-dāsi. The term sāni is derived from the term Dorasāni, wife of the lord. Sānis of the temple are called the Dēvadāśi, and they are said to be 300 in number.

Sārthavāha = a caravan merchant

Sarvādhikāri = an agent of the king

Sarasvatibhaṁḍārikuḍu = librarian

Śāsana = inscription or royal edict

Sāsanādhikāri = an officer in charge of royal orders

Satramaṭhapati = the superintendent of the choultry

Seṭṭi = the head of merchants; a title

Seṭṭi-gaṇas = merchant guilds

Seṭṭigaṇādhīsuḍu = the head of the mercantile body

Seṭṭiguttas = leaders of merchants

Shaḍangis = persons proficient in the six Vēdāṅgas

Silpikāchārya = an architect

Siṅganāthamupannu = the tax levied for the maintenance of the person who blows the horn or trumpet

Sīma = a territorial division

Srībali = offerings to the god

Srīkāryamu = the management of the temple

Śreṇi = a guild

Śreshṭhi = a merchant leader

Sthala = a group of villages

Sthalakarṇam = the head of the Sthala

Sthānanivēsanas = house sites

Sthānapati	= trustee of a temple or matha
Sthānikulu	= temple authorities
Surabhi-mādas	= coins
Svadēśibēhārulu	= resident merchants
Śvāmitana	= headship
Talāri	= a village watchman
Talārikatnamu or Talāripannu	= the fees paid to the watchman
Talavritti	= a charity
Tailayantramu	= an oil-mill
Tamtuvāyakudu or Kuvinda	= a weaver
Tāmbūlikas	= betel-sellers
Tantrapāla	= the captain of the palace guard; an officer like the resident political agent.
Tapala	=Place
Teliki-kāmpulu	= Telaga cultivators(?)
Teru	= a street
Tilapiṣakas	= oil-mongers
Tīrpari	= a judge or an arbitrator
Tōranamu	= gate way or portal
Tūmu	= sluice
Tūmu	= a measure (4 addalu = 1 tūmu; 20 tūmulu = 1 putti)
Ubhaya-nānādēśi-pekkamdru	= the itinerant merchants belong to various places of both local and distant territories.

Ulvari = field sufficiently moist for ploughing

Undrūllu = a sect of oil-mongers

Urupunēla = land fit for cultivation

Ūru = a village; the village assembly

Ūrakarnam = the village accountant

Ūra-rūka = the income derived from the village

Ūra-ratnamu = the village well

Ūratalāri = the village night-watchman

Ūri-nāyakulu = the village headmen

Ūri-vāru = the inhabitants of the village

Ūrodeya = the headman of an agrahāra

Ūrimānyamu = the village common land

Uttamagandamāda = a coin of high value

Vādi = an administrative division

Vaddarāvulamu = a kind of tax levied on all types of merchandise

Vaddavyavahāri = the head of the itinerant merchants

Vaddīdhanamu = interest amount

Vahi = time; share; instalment; record

Valapaladāpala = right and left side

Valanādu = a territorial division

Valita or Vanitamu = an administrative division

Vanamu = a garden

Varahā = gold coin equal to three and half rupees

Vartakadharmamu = a code of fair conduct followed in mercantile business

Veli = excommunication

Vetti	= free labour or one who does free labour in a village or town
Vettisaparivāramu	= persons who perform the duties of the lowest offices in a village
Vīdu or bīdu	= a business centre
Viducu	= to gift, to endow, exempt
Vanin-nagara	= a mercantile town
Vīrabalanjasamayadharma-pratipālakulu	= the protectors or followers of the established customs of the guild of the Vīrabalañjas
Vīrālamu-pannu	= a tax cum contribution
Vīrapattana	= a town of privilege in trade; a business centre of the merchants of all kinds.
Vīraśāsanamu	= a grant made for heroic services of a person; an edict containing privileges
Vīsamu	= 1/16 of hana; a kind of coin
Visaya	= a district comprising a group of villages
Vōlimaryāda	= bride's price
Vritti	= a gift, privilege, livelihood
Vyavahāragōtra	= a gōtra adopted as per convenience
Yama	= any great moral observance
Yekkadilu	= local officials(?), soldiers(?)

ABBREVIATIONS

AKT	Āndhra Kavi Taraṅgini by C. Seshaya
APER	Āndhra Pradesh Government Report on Epigraphy
APGAS	Āndhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series
AR	Annual Reports of South Indian Epigraphy The inscriptions copied on particular years and published in the reports are referred to as No.1 of 1887, No.5 of 1905, No.78 of 1926 etc.,
AS	Archaeological series, Hyderabad
Castes	Castes and Tribes of southern India by Thurston, E.
Corporate	Corporate Life in Medieval Āndhradēśa by R. Narasimha Rao
CP	Copper plate grant
CTI	Corpus of the Inscriptions in the Telaṅgāṇa Districts of H.E.H. Nizām's Dominions
CVE	Chālukya Vikrama Era
Economic	Economic Life of Northern India by Lallanji Gopal
EA	Epigraphia Āndhrica
EC	Epigraphia Carnatica
EI	Epigraphia Indica
HAS	Hyderabad Archaeological Series
HGAP	Historical Geography of Āndhra Pradesh by K.I. Dutt
History	History of the Reḍḍi Kingdoms by M.S. Sarma
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly
IA	Indian Antiquary
'ITIHAS'	Journal of the State Archieves, Hyderabad
JAHRS	Journal of the Āndhra Historical Research Society
JBBRAS	Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland

JIH	Journal of Indian History
JOR	Journal of the Oriental Research
JKU	Journal of the Karnāṭak University (Social Sciences).
JKUH	Journal of the Karnāṭak University (Humanities)
Kd. Rm.	Kreeḍabhirāmamu
KDI	Karīmnagar District Inscriptions
Kond.Sam.	Koṇḍavīṭi Sāmrājyamu by Gurubrahma Sarma
Local	Local Self-Government in Mediaeval Karnāṭaka by G.S.Dikshit
LG	Local Government in the Vijayanagara Empire by A.V.Venkata Ratnam
LR	Local Records
NDI	Nellōre District Inscriptions
QJMS	Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore
S	Śaka Era
SII	South Indian Inscriptions
SE	Select Epigraphs of Āndhra Pradesh
Studies	Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara by N.Venkataramanayya
Tel. Ins.	Telingāṇa Inscriptions
V	Verse
VR	A Topographical list of the Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency by V. Rangacharya, the inscription of this list is referred to as No.10 of ~~1910 of~~ V.R.
WDI	Waraṅgal District Inscriptions.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(A) INSCRIPTIONS

Āndhra Pradēsh Government Report on Epigraphy for 1965 and 1966 (Epigraphy series,) Hyderabad.

Āndhra Pradesh Government Archaeological series, Hyderabad.

Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1887 onwards, Calcutta.

Annual Reports of Indian Epigraphy, Delhi

Annual Reports of South Indian Epigraphy, Madras, 1887-1951.

A Corpus of Inscriptions in the Telāngāna Districts of H.E.H. the Nizām's Dominions, vols. I-IV, Hyderabad.

A Corpus of Inscriptions in the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad State, by Desai, P.B., Hyderabad, 1958.

A Topographical List of the Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency by Rangacharya, V., Vols I-III, Madras, 1919

Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Āndhra Pradesh State Museum by Ramesan, N., 2 Vols., Hyderabad.

Cuddapah Inscriptions, Tamilnādu Government Oriental Series, No. CLIZ, 1972.

Descriptive catalogue of Telugu Manuscripts.

District Gazetteers and Manuals of Āndhra Pradesh.

Epigraphia Āndhrica, Hyderabad.

Epigraphia Carnatica, Vols 1-16, Bangalore

Epigraphia Indica, Calcutta, 1892 onwards

The Historical Inscriptions of southern India by Sewell, Robert, ~~and~~ (Ed) Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, S., Madras, 1932.

Hyderabad Archaeological series, Hyderabad, 1942 onwards

Inscriptions of Āndhra Pradesh, Karīmnagar District, Epigraphical series, No.8, Hyderabad.

Inscriptions of Āndhra Pradesh, Warangal District, Epigraphical series No.7., Hyderabad.

Inscriptions of Nellore District by Butterworth, A and Venugopal chetty, V., 3 Vols., Madras, 1905.

Local Records

Select Epigraphs of Āndhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, 1970

Select stone Inscriptions from the Āndhra Pradesh Government Museum by Desai, P.B., Hyderabad.

South Indian Inscriptions, 1890 onwards, Vols 1-20, Madras.

Telangāṇa Inscriptions, Vols., 1 and 2, 1935 and 1960, Hyderabad.

Tirumalai Tirupati Dēvasthānam Inscriptions, 6 Vols., Madras, 1937-1951.

Report on the Inscriptions of Tirumalai Tirupati Dēvasthānam by Subrahmanya Sastry, S., Madras, 1930.

(B) LITERATURE

Ayyalarāju Nārāyaṇamātya, Haṁsaviṁśati (Madras, 1964).

Bhāskarāchārya, Śrī Vaiśyapurāṇamu (Madras, 1929).

Kadirīpati, Pālavēkari, Śuka Saptati (Madras, 1951)

Kētana, Vijñānēśvarīyamu.

Maḍiki Siṅgana, Sakalanītisammatamu (Hyderabad, 1970).

Mañcana, Kēyūrabāhucaritra (Ed. by V. Prabhakara Sastri)

Manu, The Laws of, Translated by George Buhler, Sacred Books of the East, XXV (Oxford, 1886).

Manuvaṃśapurāṇam (D. 160 of the catalogue of the Telugu Manuscripts, Oriental Mss. Library, Madras).

Nannaya, Mahābhāratamu (Madras, 1967)

Nanne Choḍa, Kumāra Saṃbhavamu (Hyderabad, 1968)

Pālkurki Sōmanātha, Basavapurāṇamu (Madras, 1952) and Paṇḍitārādhyacaritra (Madras, 1939).

Prabhākara Sastry, V., compiled by, Cāṭupadyamaṇimañjari (Madras, 1922-1924)

Sharma, M.S., Ed., Kāṭamarājucaritra

Shama Sastry, R., Ed., Kautilya's Arthaśāstra (Bangalore, 1923)

Siṃhāsana Dvātriṃsika (Kakinada, 1933)

Somēśvara III, Mānasōllāsa, Vol. 11, Ed. by Shrigondekar, G.K., Gaekwad's Oriental series, LXXXIV (Baroda, 1939).

Srīnātha, Haravilāsamu (Hyderabad, 1968) and Palnāṭivīracaritra (Madras, 1955)

Vallabhāmātya, Krīdābhirāmamu (Madras, 1966)

Vijñānēsvara, Mitākshara (second Edition, Edited by Gharpura, J.R.) (Bombay, 1939).

Wilson, H.H., The Mackenzie Collection, A Descriptive catalogue of the Oriental Manuscripts, and other articles illustrative of History, Statistics and Antiquities of the South India, collected by the late H.H. Wilson (2nd Edition), 2 Vols. (calcutta, 1828; Madras, 1882).

(C) JOURNALS

Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Bhārati, Madras.

Indian Antiquary

Indian Historical quarterly.

Journal of Andhra History and culture.

Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society.

Journal of the Asiatic society of Bengal.

Journal of the Andhra Sāhitya Parishad patrika.

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna.

Journal of Indian History, Trivandrum.

Journal of the University of Madras.

Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.

Journal of the Asiatic Society.

Journal of Hyderabad Archaeological Society, Hyderabad.

~~Journal of~~ New Indian Antiquary, Bombay.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore.

Journal of the Telugu Academy, Madras.

Journal of the State Archives, Hyderabad.

Journal of the Karnatak University, Humanities and Social Sciences

Journal of Tirupati Dēvasthānam oriental Research Society, Tirupati.

Proceedings of Indian History congress.

(D) MODERN WORKS

Altekar, A.S., A History of village communities in Western India (Madras, 1927).

State and Government in Ancient India (Delhi, 1962).

The Rāshtrakūtas and their times, (Poona, 1934).

Aiyangar, Krishnasvamy, S., South India and Her Mohammadan Invaders (Oxford, 1921).

Evolution of the Hindu Administrative Institutions in Southern India (Madras, 1931).

Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture, 2 vols. (Poona, 1941).

Aiyar, Subrahmanya, K.V., Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan (Madras, 1957).

Three Lectures (Dharwar, 1941).

Appadorai, A., Economic conditions of southern India A.D.1000-1500, Vols. 1 and 2 (Madras, 1936).

Baden Powell, B.P., The Indian Village community (London, 1828).

Basham, A.L., The wonder that was India (London, 1954).

Bhandarkar, R.G., Early History of the Deccan. Down to the Muslim conquest (Calcutta, 1928).

~~Early History of Deccan (Bombay, 1885).~~

Commemoration Volume (Poona, 1917).

Burnell, A.C., Elements of South Indian Palaeography, Edn. II (London, 1878).

Derrett, J.D.M., Hoysalas (London, 1957).

Desai, P.B., Jainism in South India (Sholapur, 1957).

Desai, Dinkar, The Mahāmandalēsvaras under the Chālukyas of Kalyāni (Bombay, 1951).

Dikshit, G.S., Local Self-government in Mediaeval Karnātaka (Dharwar, 1964).

Dikshitar, V.R.R., Hindu Administrative Institutions (Madras, 1929).

Studies in Tamil Literature and History (Madras, 1936).

Francis, W., Anantapur, Madras District Gazetteers (Madras,1906).

Bellary, Madras District Gazetteers (Madras, 1904).

Ghoshal, U.N., The Agrarian system in Ancient India (Calcutta, 1930).

Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue system (Calcutta, 1929).

Studies in Indian History and Culture (Calcutta, 1957).

A History of Indian political Ideas (Oxford, 1959).

Gribble, A History of the Deccan, 2 vols. (London, 1896-1924).

Ganguly, D.C., The Eastern Chālukyas (Benaras, 1937).

Gopalacharya, K., Early History of the Andhra country (Madras, 1941).

Karnātaka Through the Ages, published by the Government of Mysore (Bangalore, 1968).

Kane, P.V., History of Dharmasāsastra, vols. 1-5 (Poona, 1930-1962).

Krishna Rao, B.V., History of the Early Dynasties of Andhra Desa (Madras, 1942).

History of the Early Chālukyas of Vengi, A.D.,610-1210 (Hyderabad, 1973).

Krishna Rao, M.V., The Gangas of Talakad (Madras, 1936).

Lallanji Gopal, Economic Life of Northern India, 700-1200 A.D. (Delhi, 1965).

Mahalingam, T.V., Administration and Social Life under Vijayanagara (Madras, 1940).

Economic Life in the Vijayanagara Empire (Madras, 1951).

South Indian polity (Madras, 1967).

Maity, S.K., Economic Life of Northern India in the Gupta period C.A.D. 300-550 (Calcutta, 1957).

Majumdar, R.C., Corporate Life in Ancient India (ii Ed., Poona 1922).

Majumdar, R.C. and ‖ (Ed) The History and culture of the Indian people,
Pusalker, A.D. ‖ Vol. IV, The Age of Imperial Kanauj (Bombay, 1955).
Vol. V, the struggle for Empire (Bombay, 1957).
Vol. VI, The Delhi Sultanate (Bombay, 1960).

Mookerjee, R.K. Local Government in Ancient India (iii Ed., New Delhi, 1956).

Meenakshi, C., Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas (Madras, 1938).

Moraes, G.M., The Kadamba Kula (Bombay, 1931).

Narasimha Rao, R., Corporate Life in Mediaeval Andhradēsa (~~U.G.C.,~~ Secunderabad, 1967).

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A., Studies in Cōla History and Administration (Madras, 1932).
The Cōlas, II Edition (Madras, 1955),
A History of South India, II Edition (Madras, 1966).
Foreign Notices of South India (Madras, 1939).

Rama Rao, M., Political History of the Kākatīyas (JAHRS Vol. V)

Ramaswamy Ayyangar, M.A., ‖ Studies in South Indian Jainism
and Seshagiri Rao B., ‖ (Madras, 1922).

Ramesan, N., Studies in Mediaeval Deccan History (Hyderabad, 1972).

Rice, B. Lewis, Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions (London, 1909).

Saletore, B.A., Ancient Karnātaka, Vol. I, History of Tuluva (Poona, 1936).
Social and political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire, Vols. 2 (Madras, 1934).

Sathianathaier, R., Studies in the Ancient History of Tondamandalam (Madras, 1944)
History of the Nāyakas of Madura (Madras, 1924)

Sircar, D.C., Successors of the Satavahanas in the Lower Deccan (Calcutta, 1939).

Sinha, S.K., Medieval History of the Deccan, vols 1 and 2 (Hyderabad, 1964, 1967).

Somasekhara Sarma, M., History of the Reddi kingdoms (A.D. 1325-1448) (Waltair, 1948).

A Forgotten chapter of Andhra History (Waltair, 1945).

Subba Rao, R., History of the Eastern Gangas of Kalinga (JAHRS, Vol. VI).

Sundaram, K., Social and Economic condition in Medieval Andhra, (Machilipatnam, 1968).

Subrahmanyam, R., The Suryavamsa Gajapatis of Orissa (Waltair, 1957).

Subrahmanyan, K.R., Buddhist Remains in Andhra and the History of Andhra (Madras, 1932).

Thurston, E., Castes and Tribes of Southern India, Vol. I-VII (Madras 1909).

Venkateswara, S.V., Indian Culture Through the Ages, 2 Vols. (Mysore, 1932).

Venkataramanayya, N., Eastern Chālukyas of Vengi (Madras, 1950).

Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara (Madras, 1935).

Venkataratnam, A.V., Local Government in the Vijayanagara Empire (Mysore, 1972).

Vaidya, C.V., History of Medieval India, Vols. 1, 2 and 3 (Poona, 1921, 1924 and 1926).

Vaidehi Krishnamoorthy, A., Social and Economic conditions in Eastern Deccan (A.D.1000-1250) (Madras,1970).

Vijayanagara Sex-Centenary commemoration Volume (Dharwar, 1936).

Yazdani, G., (Edited) The Early History of the Deccan, Vols.1-2 (London, 1960).

Studies in Indian History and culture (Dharwar, 1971).

The Hoysala Dynasty, (Edited) Dr. B. Shaik Ali (Mysore, 1972).

Prof. S. Srikantha Sastry Felicitation Volume (Mysore, 1973).

(E) MODERN WORKS (TELUGU)

Arudra, Samagraha Āndhra Sāhaityam, (Madras, 1965).

Gurubrahma Sarma, M., Koṇḍavīṭi Sāmrājyamu (Narasaraopeta, 1935).

Iswara Dutt, K., Historical Geography of Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad, 1963)

Pratapareḍḍi, S., Āndhrula Sānghika Charitra

Seshaya, C., Āndhra Kavi Tarangani, (Kapilēśvarapuram, 1955).

Somasekhara Sarma, M., Vijnana Sarvasvam

Telugu samskriti, Vol. III (Madras, 1959).

Veeresalingam, K., Āndhra Kavula Charitra

Veerabhadra Rao, C., Āndhrula charitra, 3 parts.

Vēngi Samcika, (Rajahmundry, 1974) (Telugu).

Kākatiya Samcika (Rajahmundry, 1935) (Telugu).

Kaliṅga Samcika, (Rajahmundry)

Reḍḍi Samcika, (Rajahmundry, 1947) (Telugu)

Śrī Rājarāja Narēndra paṭṭabhiṣēka samcika, (Rajahmundry)

(F) DICTIONARIES

Apte, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary (Delhi, 1965)

Brown, A Telugu-English Dictionary (Hyderabad, 1974).

Kittel, A Kannada-English Dictionary (Madras, 1968).

Monier Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary (Varanasi, 1961)

Śabdaratnākaram (Madras, 1969).

GLOSSARY

Iswara Dutt, K., Inscriptional Glossary of Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad, 1967).

Sircar, D.C., Epigraphical Glossary (Delhi, 1966).

Srinivasachari, P., Glossary (CTI, part-11, pp.201-12)

Wilson, H.H., Glossary of Revenue Terms and phrases.

(G) THESES

Karnatak University Library, Dharwar

(i) Shantakumari, S.L., Agraharas in Ancient Karnāṭaka (1970).

(ii) Kuppuswamy Iyengar, G.R., Economic conditions in Karnāṭaka from the end of the 10th century to the beginning of the 14th century (1969)

(iii) Ramachandra Rao, C.V., Administration and Social Life under the later Eastern Gaṅgās and the Gajapatis (1972).

Osmania University Library, Hyderabad.

(i) Narasimha Rao, R., Life in Mediaeval Āndhra A.D. 1000-1450.

(ii) Nagabhushanam, A., Economic conditions in Western Deccan A.D. 1000-1300 (1971).

(iii) Madhusudan Reddy, K., Theory and practice of Government in Mediaeval Āndhradeśa, C.A.D.1000-1400 (1973).

(H) ARTICLES IN RESEARCH JOURNALS

Aiyar, Subrahmanya, K.V., "A Note on the Panchavara Committee", EI, 23, pp.22-28.

"The Largest provincial organisations in India", QJMS, XLV, pp.29-47, 70-98, 279-286, XLVI, pp.8-12.

Arokiasvami, M., "Democratic Experments in Ancient South India", JIH, XXXV, p.335 ff.

Ayyar, Venkatarama, K.R., "Medieaval Trade, Craft and Merchant Guilds in South India", JIH, XXV pp.269-280.

Baden Powell, B.H., "A study of the Deccan Villages, Their origin and Development", JRAS, 1897, pp.279-299.

"The origin of village Land-tenures in India", JRAS, 1896, pp.605-616.

Balasubrahmanyam, S.R., "Local Government in Ancient India", JOR, XIII, p. 46 ff.

Derrett, J.D.M., "A New Light on the Mitāksara as a Legal Authority", JIH, XXX, p. 35 ff.

Devanathachariar, K., "Indian Village Administration in the Buddhist period", QJMS, VII, p. 16-41.

Dikshit, G.S.,

1. "Some Aspects of the working of Local Assemblies in Mediaeval Karnātaka", JKU, Vol. I, SS, pp.107-110.
2. "Popular participation in Early Indian Governments", P.B. Desai Felicitation Volume, 1971, pp.302.
3. "Mahānādu", Prof. S.Srikantha Sastry Felicitation Volume, 1973, pp.92-96.

UNIVERSITY ... LIBRARY

4. "Group organisation in Mediaeval Karnātaka", JKUH, Vol. I, pp.59-64.

5. "Constitution of the Trade Guilds in Mediaeval Karnāṭaka", JKUH, Vol. III, pp.53-57.

6. "The Okkalu", JKUH, Vol. IV, pp.58 ff.

7. "Trade Guilds under the Chālukyas of Kalyani", PIHC, 1951, pp.122,125.

8. "Numerical suffixes of Territorial Divisions in Mediaeval Karnāṭaka", JIH, XLI, pp.235 ff.

9. "Economic conditions in the time of Krishnadēvarāya", Vijayanagara Sex-Centenary commemoration Volume, pp.213-230.

Dikshitar, Ramachandra V.R., "Early History of Kurnool", JIH, XXX, pp.309 ff.

Dutt, Iswara, K., "Studies in Vijayanagara polity, A.D.1336-1542", JAHRS, IV, pp.165-188; V, pp.7-30.

Gopala Reddy, Y, "Agriculture under the Kākatīyas" Itihas, Vol. I. "Some Measures and Weights in Mediaeval Andhra" JAHRS, XXXII, 1971-72.

Gururajachar, S.,"The Vīra-Bajañjus of Karnāṭaka" Prof. P.B.Desai Felicitation Volume, pp.307-313.

Karmarkar, A.P., "Administrative machinery in Mediaeval Karnātaka", QJMS, KMN, pp.435-451.

Lallanji Gopal, "Economic Groups and the caste system in Ancient India", JIH, XLIII, part III, 1965, pp.771-781.

Mookerjee, R.K., "India's Democratic Traditions", JIH, XL, p.583 ff.

Narasimha Rao, R., "Merchant Guilds in Mediaeval Āndhra"
PIHC, 1954, pp.217-226.

Nilakantha Sastri, K.A., "Foreign Trade Under the Kākatīyas",
JOR, 8, pp.315-320.
"Kalinga wars of the reign of Kulōttuṅga",
JOR, 10, pp.295-301.

Pillai, K.K., "The temple as a cultural centre", JOR, 25, pp.83-94.

Sampath, M.D., "The Chitramēḻi", Prof. P.B.Desai Felicitation Volume, pp.314-319.

Somasekhara Sarma, M., "The chronology of the Eastern Chālukyas",
JOR, o, pp.17-45.
"Vēṅgi one thousand", JOR, XI
"A Note on Daśaśatasakaladharaṇītala", Āndhrapatrika, 1927, p.162 ff.

Srinivasachari, C.S., "The Origin of the Right Hand and Left Hand Divisions" JAHRS, IV, pp.77-85.

Venkataramayya, M., "Western Chālukya and Chōḷa conflict in Vēṅgi",
JOR, XVII, pp.129-137.

Venkataratnam, A.V., "Village Autonomy under the Hoysalas"
The Hoysala Dynasty, 1972, pp.133-140.

Venkateswara Rao, T., "Local Self-Government in Mediaeval Āndhra",
JAHRS, XXXI, pp.113-123.
"The Nakaram of Penugonda in Mediaeval Āndhra",
JAHRS, XXX, pp.207-214.

Venkayya, V., "Ancient History of the Nellore District",
IA, 37, pp.199 ff; 38, pp. 7 ff.